DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 360 748 EA 025 204

AUTHOR	Stefkovich, Jacqueline A., Ed.
TITLE	Sourcebook of Restructuring Initiatives.
INSTITUTION	Research for Better Schools, Inc., Philadelphia, Pa.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	May 93
CONTRACT	RP91002004
NOTE	85p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Research for Better Schools, Inc., 444 North Third Street, Philadelphia, PA 19123.
PUB TYPE	Reference Materials - Bibliographies (131) -- Reference Materials - Directories/Catalogs (132)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Change; *Educational Innovation; Elementary Secondary Education; *National Programs; *Nontraditional Education; Organizational Change; *School Restructuring

ABSTRACT

This three-part sourcebook identifies school restructuring initiatives with a national scope and presents comprehensive information about them. Part 1 identifies and describes national restructuring programs (e.g., Coalition of Essential Schools, Learning Tomorrow, Success for All). Each program description provides an overview of the program as well as information on its purpose and goals, key features, intended audience or participants, available resources, funding sources and/or costs, and a contact person. The second part is devoted to national restructuring centers (e.g., Center for Leadership Reform, Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools). Each of the descriptions contains an overview of the center, including its definition of restructuring, a statement of its mission and goals, and information on available resources and funding sources. In each case, a contact address and list of selected readings are also provided. Part 3 focuses on national restructuring agencies (e.g., Business Roundtable, Holmes Group, National Governors' Association) that have either sponsored projects and/or developed materials relevant to school restructuring efforts. Each entry contains an overview of the agency's restructuring effort and information on available materials, a contact source, and a list of selected readings. The appendix includes a list of regional educational laboratories. (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 360 748

SOURCEBOOK OF RESTRUCTURING INITIATIVES

Jacqueline A. Stefkovich

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

RBS
Research For Better Schools, Inc.
444 North Third Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19123

EA 025 204

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This publication is based on work sponsored, wholly or in part, by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI), U.S. Department of Education, under contract number RP91002004. The content of this publication does not necessarily reflect the views of OERI, the Department, or any other agency of the U.S. Government.

SOURCEBOOK OF RESTRUCTURING INITIATIVES

edited by:

Jacqueline A. Stefkovich
Research for Better Schools, Inc.
444 North Third Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19123

May 1993

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
INTRODUCTION	1
PART I: NATIONAL RESTRUCTURING PROGRAMS	5
Coalition of Essential Schools	7
Foxfire	11
The League of Schools Reaching Out	17
Learning Tomorrow	21
The Learning Laboratories Initiative	25
Re:Learning	27
School Development Program	29
The Stanford Accelerated Schools Project	33
Success for All	37
PART II: NATIONAL RESTRUCTURING CENTERS	41
Center for Leadership in School Reform	43
Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools	47
National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools, and Teaching	51
NEA National Center for Innovation	53
PART III: NATIONAL RESTRUCTURING AGENCIES	57
AFT Department of Educational Issues	59
Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development	61
Business Roundtable	63
Center for Educational Renewal	65
Center for Technology in Education	67
Center for Workforce Preparation and Quality Education	69
Consortium for Policy Research in Education	71
Council of Chief State School Officers	73
Education Commission of the States	75
The Holmes Group	77
Indiana University	79
Institute for Responsive Education	81
National Alliance for Restructuring Education	83
National Association of State Boards of Education	85
National Governors' Association	87
APPENDIX: LIST OF REGIONAL EDUCATIONAL LABORATORIES	89

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A number of persons at Research for Better Schools, Inc. (RBS) assisted in the development of the sourcebook. Their contributions proved invaluable to this effort. Mercedes Fitzmaurice and Edward Patrick freely contributed their knowledge of the many contacts, both regionally and nationally, that they possessed and assisted in writing some of the descriptions. Peter Donahoe was broadly informed on the many materials that have been produced on school restructuring and with most of the various organizations that have served as producers. He used RBS' extensive computer-based resource system to identify relevant initiatives and to prepare bibliographies. Arlene Ziviello Large provided a number of suggestions about the overall concept of the project and wrote some of the agency descriptions. John A. Kinslow contacted each and every source and verified the accuracy of all the entries. John E. Hopkins, Executive Director of RBS, edited the final document. Doris Harris meticulously prepared the typescript and placed all entries into APA format.

Jacqueline Stefkovich,
Editor

INTRODUCTION

The Sourcebook of Restructuring Initiatives was developed in response to an often-expressed need on the part of educators for assistance in gaining information about available resources on school restructuring.

This introduction presents three aspects of the sourcebook:

- a statement of its purpose
- a brief account of the processes that have governed its development
- a description of its organization and content.

Purpose of the Sourcebook

The report, A Nation at Risk (1983), provided a powerful observation on the risk confronting the country as a result of the poor condition of its educational systems:

> "If an unfriendly foreign power had attempted to impose on America the mediocre educational performance that exists today, we might well have viewed it as an act of war" (p. 5).

Since that time, there have been many efforts to improve the schools, leading, ultimately, to efforts to reform them. These more recent efforts toward reform have come to be known as school restructuring.

Exactly what "restructuring" is and what constitutes a restructured school have not always been clear. Corbett (1990) has suggested that the focus cannot remain on "school" at all: entire districts, and not just isolated schools, must be restructured. He defines school restructuring as a fundamental change in the "rules, roles, relationships, and results" for a school district.

If restructuring lacks precision and definition, it is not for a lack of followers. Since the movement began, it would seem that almost everyone with any stake in the improvement of education has climbed on this bandwagon. This interest has led to efforts of varying kinds, and to the release of considerable information on the topic. What has been lacking is a document that integrates information on these efforts.

In response, the purpose of this sourcebook is to identify restructuring initiatives with a national scope and present organized and comprehensive information about them in a practically usable format.

It is our hope that this information will assist local practitioners who are planning or implementing restructuring efforts in their districts to locate the information that they need, such as available resources, references, materials, and contacts. In the nature of things, it is impossible to create a book that will respond to all needs. An effort has been made,

however, to pull together information on the major activities that are underway and to make it available in a single comprehensive source.

This information may also assist others such as educational researchers and policymakers who, like the Research for Better Schools (RBS) staff working on restructuring, are attempting to sort and understand what materials and resources are available.

Development of the Sourcebook

The concept of a sourcebook began as part of a proposal by RBS for 1990-1995 that was funded through the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement. As the sourcebook concept emerged, a sourcebook committee consisting of persons with a variety of backgrounds and expertise was formed.

Initially, the sourcebook committee expected this publication to identify and describe restructuring programs in school districts in the Mid-Atlantic region that RBS serves: Delaware, the District of Columbia, Maryland, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. However, a thorough computer search, extensive networking inquiries in the region, and a systematic canvassing of RBS staff who spend extensive time in the field unearthed very few fully-active restructuring programs. Most of the region's local restructuring efforts were still in the planning stages.

The few programs that did exist, such as the NEA Learning Laboratory in the Greensburg-Salem (PA) School District, the Re:Learning projects in Delaware and Pennsylvania, and the various Coalition of Essential Schools (CES) programs throughout the region, were not "home grown" but were, instead, local programs based on national models.

Since most of our region's programs were thus either based on national models or anxiously searching for materials and resources, we came to the conclusion that a more helpful resource would be one that could identify national restructuring programs and organize and make sense of the various agencies that provide information and materials on this important topic. Accordingly, the sourcebook has focused on restructuring activity that is national in scope.

Organization of the Sourcebook

This sourcebook is organized into three broad areas: (1) programs, (2) centers, and (3) agencies. The defining criteria for these categories have largely been informal. A program is viewed as a fairly specific and directed effort to promote change, or an advocated method of change; a center is a more general source of information and service but still focuses on restructuring; and an agency is a still more general source of assistance where one or more of its aspects are relevant to the restructuring enterprise.

While the programs presented in Part I of this document rest on varying definitions of school restructuring, they all basically fit into Corbett's definition in that they require a fundamental change in rules, roles,

relationships, and results if they are implemented. In other words, these programs require very significant changes and not mere "tinkering." However, the programs tend to be much less definite about the results they will produce.

Part II of this document identifies and describes restructuring centers. Some "centers" are listed among the "agencies" presented in Part III, but they all have broader purposes beyond restructuring. The centers in this section are more focused; their entire mission is dedicated to school restructuring as they have defined it. (Where available, each center's definition of school restructuring has been included in its descriptive overview.)

Part III identifies and describes agencies that are not devoted exclusively to school restructuring but which have sponsored projects and/or developed materials that are relevant to school restructuring efforts. Generally, these agencies have not formally defined restructuring; where they have, however, this definition has been included in the description of the agency.

In addition, a list of the regional educational laboratories funded by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) is included as an appendix. Most of these educational laboratories are involved in the school restructuring movement and many have written materials available as well as other resources. Research for Better Schools is the educational laboratory for the Mid-Atlantic region.

References

Corbett, H. D. (1990). On the meaning of restructuring. Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

PART I

NATIONAL RESTRUCTURING PROGRAMS

This section of the sourcebook identifies and describes national restructuring programs. Each program description provides an overview of the program as well as other pertinent information such as: the program's purpose and goals, key features of the program, the program's intended audience or participants, available resources, and funding sources and/or costs. Each entry also includes the name, address, and telephone number of a contact person for further information; and selected readings.

COALITION OF ESSENTIAL SCHOOLS

1. **Sponsor(s):** Coalition of Essential Schools (CES)

   Grade Level: Primarily high school, junior high school, and/or middle school

2. **Overview:** The Coalition of Essential Schools (CES) was established at Brown University in 1984 as a high school-university partnership. The CES philosophy exists in more than 500 schools across the country and in one Canadian province. These schools are committed to rethinking their priorities and redesigning their pedagogies, curricula, and structures. Each school develops a plan appropriate to its own setting. The CES schools hold in common a set of nine principles that give focus to their effort.

   CES school staff work to create schools that have:

   - an intellectual focus geared toward helping students use their minds well
   - simple goals wherein students master a limited number of essential skills and knowledge
   - universal goals that apply to all students
   - personalized teaching/learning procedures and site-based instructional decisionmaking
   - students engaged as workers learning-to-learn, while teachers play more of a coaching role
   - diplomas awarded upon successful exhibitions of mastery of essential skills and knowledge
   - climates or tones that reflect trust, strong expectations, fairness, and mutual respect
   - staff perceiving themselves first as generalists and then as specialists
   - budgets wherein per-pupil-costs are no more than ten percent above those of traditional schools.

   Each of these nine common principles has major implications for how schools are organized and structured and for how the tasks of learning and teaching should proceed.

3. **Purpose and Goals:** The CES was established to create a structure and support network for schools engaged in operationalizing the common principles.

4. **Key Features:** Mastery of a limited number of essential skills and knowledge; teachers as coaches; site-based instructional decisionmaking.

5. **Audience or Participants:** More than 500 schools across the country and in Canada participate in CES.

6. **Impact:** Definitive studies of the impact of CES are not yet available. The broad scope of this educational change initiative dictates that multiple studies, at multiple levels, each employing selected criteria, will be required to gauge its impact. In that regard, a five-year ethnographic study of CES sites, and a pilot "common measures" (e.g., achievement, attendance, and dropout rates) study have been completed. Annual "common measures" studies and reports are planned, along with a nine-year study under the aegis of a new Coalition (CES) project known as "Taking Stock."

   As part of "Taking Stock," annual "common and uncommon measures studies" of selected sites will be conducted. A nine-year study to follow some 75 students through high school and for five years beyond has also been initiated. Finally, ongoing research on the school change process is underway.

   Preliminary ethnographic findings reinforce the difficulties involved in effecting schoolwide change. Selected anecdotal and "common measures" data provide preliminary evidence of the initiative's positive impact on attendance and dropout rates, academic performance, discipline, pursuit of higher education, and teachers' and students' satisfaction with the CES approach to schooling.

7. **Resources:** Available services include various CES-related workshops and institutes for educators at the Coalition's headquarters at Brown University; advanced multi-week training for participating school faculty (Citibank faculty) and administrators (Thompson fellows) at Brown; week-long workshops for school teams (school TREK) and district teams (district TREK) offered at various sites.

   Among the materials available are various periodicals, working papers, recommended readings, and research reports detailed in CES' publications list. Of particular interest are:

   - The TREK: A Year-Long Course of Study, An Action Framework for School Change, a report
   - District TREK publications
   - Horace, a free newsletter.

   CES has a central office staff of about 35 people (administration, projects, information/communications, research, school/state support, and support staff).

8. **Funding Sources/Costs:** The Coalition has received funds from many contributors, some of which include: the Aetna Foundation, Carnegie Corporation, Citibank, Danforth Foundation, Exxon Education Foundation, IBM, Kraft General Foods, John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation,

Pew Charitable Trusts, Rockefeller Brothers Fund, Southwestern Bell Foundation, Xerox, the Mellon Foundation, the San Francisco Foundation, the Aaron Diamond Foundation, the Hearst Foundation, the DeWitt Wallace-Reader's Digest Fund, and RJR-Nabisco.

Per-pupil costs vary from school to school. CES emphasizes the reallocation of existing budgets to implement its program. Professional development and planning time account for most additional costs of the program.

9. **Contact for Further Information:**

Lisa Lasky
Coordinator, Information Center
Coalition of Essential Schools
Brown University
Box 1969
Providence, RI 02912
401-863-2847
401-863-2045 (FAX)

10. **Selected Readings:**

Aronoff, W., & Toloudis, M. (1987). The view from the coalition classroom. American Educator, 11, 22-23.

Brandt, R. (1988). On changing secondary schools: A conversation with Ted Sizer. Educational Leadership, 45(5), 30-35.

Chion-Kenney, L. (1987). The Coalition of Essential Schools: A report from the field. American Educator, 11, 18-27.

Cushman, K. (1989). Schedules that bind. American Educator, 13, 35-39.

Powell, A. G., Farrar, E., & Cohen, D. K. (1985). The shopping mall high school: Winners and losers in the educational marketplace. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Prestine, N. A. (1992). Benchmarks of change: Assessing essential school restructuring efforts. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April 20-24, 1992.

Sizer, T. R. (1992). Horace's school: Redesigning the American high school. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Sizer, T. R. (1989). Diverse practice, shared ideas: The essential school. In Organizing for Learning: Toward the 21st Century. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Sizer, T. R. (1985). Horace's compromise: The dilemma of the American high school. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Wasley, P. A. (1991). Stirring the chalk dust: Changing practices in essential schools. Teachers College Record, 93, 28-58.

FOXFIRE*

1. **Sponsor(s):** The Foxfire Fund, Inc.

   Grade Level: K-12 and college

2. **Overview:** Foxfire began in 1966 with the efforts of high school teacher Eliot Wigginton to stimulate his students' interest in language and learning. One of Wigginton's English classes decided to produce a quarterly magazine, Foxfire, for and about their community in rural Appalachian Georgia. In 1972, Doubleday published a selection of articles from the magazine in book form. Approximately 200 student magazines modeled on Foxfire sprang up in communities throughout the country over the next several years. During the next 25 years, the program expanded into all grade levels and content areas. In 1986, the organization launched a major teacher outreach initiative.

   The Foxfire program is based on 11 core practices, based on these pedagogical principles:

   - People learn best when education builds on previous experience.
   - The work teachers and students do together must flow from student desires and concerns.
   - School work must be connected to the surrounding community and to the real world.
   - Student work must have an audience beyond the teacher.

   Foxfire does not portray itself as a "reform movement," but rather as an approach that can be implemented in almost any school structure. The Foxfire approach includes students of mixed ages and ability levels in one classroom. Here, students develop and work on projects and activities they consider relevant and important. Foxfire teachers use state and local curricula as guidelines, but specific content and methods for each class vary according to student projects and needs. Students examine and discuss what they are learning in "debriefing" sessions. Teachers assess student performance and needs continually to determine what each student has mastered and what areas need more attention.

   In the Foxfire program, administrators help coordinate resources and create a school environment to make student-centered learning possible. Teachers model the flexibility, curiosity, and attitudes of students and help students discover, define, and pursue worthwhile work. The responsibility for education belongs to the whole community.

---

*Portions of this description are excerpted from: Education Commission of the States. (1991). Restructuring the education system: A consumer's guide, Vol. 1. Denver: Author.

3. **Purpose and Goals:** This program has specific goals for students. They include:

   - helping students become willing and able participants in their own education
   - developing students' understanding of community and culture
   - supporting teamwork and the democratic process in the classroom
   - facilitating analytical and reflective thought
   - enabling students to take "measured risks" toward personal growth and intellectual development
   - advancing the appreciation of imagination, reflection, and aesthetic experience.

4. **Key Features:** Community involvement; cooperative learning; democratic classrooms; higher order thinking skills.

5. **Audience or Participants:** Foxfire programs take place in approximately 2,000 classrooms throughout the country. Foxfire teacher networks operate in the following states:

   - California
   - Florida
   - Georgia
   - Idaho
   - Illinois
   - Kentucky
   - Maine
   - Nevada
   - New York
   - North Carolina
   - Ohio
   - Oregon
   - Tennessee
   - Washington
   - West Virginia

   An Urban Foxfire initiative links Foxfire teachers in New York City, Washington, DC, Cleveland (OH), Philadelphia (PA), Louisville (KY), Asheville (NC), Atlanta (GA), Orlando (FL), Seattle (WA), and the Bay Area (CA).

6. **Impact:** Work in Foxfire classrooms is measured through a variety of assessments including project debriefings, student portfolios and performances, standardized tests, course objectives checkoffs, parent commentaries, and anecdotal records of the course and students. Effectiveness of the Teacher Outreach Program is measured by tracking the degree to which teachers implement the Foxfire approach in their classes by assessments of student achievements.

   Foxfire collaborates in programs with the Coalition of Essential Schools, National Center for School Renewal, state and local restructuring initiatives, and programs sponsored by the National Center for Restructuring Schools, Education, and Teaching.

7. **Resources:** Initial training and continuing support are provided by all Foxfire-affiliated teacher networks across the country. The Teacher Outreach Program works through "host institutions," mostly colleges and

universities, that sponsor Foxfire courses and workshops and serve as home bases for the teacher networks. Workshops are available to Foxfire teachers in which instructors deal with both theoretical and practical aspects of implementing the program. Follow-up and support are the essential components of the programs for teachers.

Advanced training and special focus programs for Foxfire teachers are provided at the Foxfire Center. Foxfire teachers' case studies and other relevant articles are published in a quarterly for teachers entitled Hands On.

8. **Funding Sources/Costs:** An endowment created by Foxfire book sales provides funding for this initiative. In addition, the Foxfire Fund and Foxfire Teacher Outreach Program have received grants from other sources such as the Appalachian Regional Commission; Apple Computer, Inc.; The Bingham Trust; the Coca-Cola Foundation; DeWitt Wallace-Reader's Digest Fund; The Hearst Foundation; Charles Loridans Foundation; Andrew W. Mellon Foundation; the Public Welfare Foundation; and the Rockefeller Brothers Fund.

   There is no additional per-pupil cost for implementing Foxfire.

9. **Contact for Further Information:**

   Kim Cannon, Outreach Assistant
   Foxfire Teacher Outreach
   P.O. Box 541
   Mountain City, GA 30562
   706-746-5318
   706-746-3185 (FAX)

10. **Selected Readings:**

DeYoung, A. (forthcoming). Today Kentucky, tomorrow America? Linking the Foxfire philosophy of teaching to contemporary American school reform. In B. Jones (Ed.), The New American school: Alternative concepts and practices. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.

Duncan, B. (1991). The Foxfire approach: Ongoing teacher research. In M. J. McGee (Ed.), Diversity and design: Studying culture and the individual. Conference proceedings from the fourth annual conference of qualitative research. Athens, GA: University of Georgia, Athens.

Eddy, J. (1991). Evaluating Foxfire's teacher outreach program: A summary report of the program's first phase. Hands on: A journal for for teachers. Mountain City, GA: Foxfire Teacher Outreach.

Eddy, J., & Smith, H. (1991). Assessments of the Foxfire approach in the classrooms of affiliated teacher networks, Part five: Final report. Mountain City, GA: Foxfire Teacher Outreach.

Ensminger, G., & Dangel, H. (1992). The Foxfire pedagogy: A confluence of best practices for special education. Focus on Exceptional Children, 24(7).

Kugelmass, J. (nd). The challenge in cultural diversity. In A. Bauer (Ed.), Children who challenge the system. Norwood, NJ. Ablex Publishing.

McDonald, J. P. (1992). Teaching: Making sense of an uncertain craft. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College Press.

Smith, H. (1992). Democratic dialects: Foxfire teacher networks. In J. Novak (Ed.), Democratic teacher education. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Smith, H. (1991). Foxfire-affiliated teacher networks. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Smith, H. (1991). Authentic work via the Foxfire approach. National Center on Effective Schools News Letter, 5(3).

Smith, H. (1991). Foxfire teacher networks. Staff development: New demands, new realities, new perspectives, 2nd edition. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College Press.

Smith, H., Wigginton, E., Hocking, K., & Jones, B. (1991). Foxfire teacher networks. In Lieberman, A., & Miller, L. (Eds.), Staff development for education in the 90's. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College Press.

Teets, S. (1990). The Foxfire approach to instruction: Student performance on alternative forms of assessment and standardized tests. Report to the Appalachian Educational Laboratory.

Teets, S. (1989). The Foxfire teacher networks as a vehicle for teacher empowerment: Partnerships with small colleges. In Proceedings of the Association for Independent Liberal Arts Colleges for Teacher Education. Indianapolis.

Teets, S., & Mobley, J. (1992). Assessment in the second-grade classroom: A Foxfire story. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College Press.

Wicks, D. (1992). Teachers' first year experience implementing Foxfire: A study of the Louisville Area Foxfire Network. Louisville, KY: University of Louisville.

Wigginton, E. (nd). Developing America's talent: The link with assessment (cassette tape). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Wigginton, E. (1992). Culture begins at home. Educational Leadership, 49(4).

Wigginton, E. (1989). Foxfire grows up. Harvard Educational Review, 59(1).

Wigginton, E. (1985). Sometimes a shining moment. New York: Doubleday.

Wigginton, E., & Smith, H. (1987). Untitled paper for Symposium on Structural Change in Secondary Schools present to the National Center on Effective Secondary Schools, May, 1987. (Available from Foxfire Teacher Outreach.)

Wood, G. H. (1992). Schools that work: America's most innovative public education programs. New York: E. P. Dutton.

THE LEAGUE OF SCHOOLS REACHING OUT

1. **Sponsor(s):** The Institute for Responsive Education (IRE)

   Grade Level: Districtwide

2. **Overview:** A major restructuring program of the Institute for Responsive Education (IRE), The League of Schools Reaching Out, is both an international network and a reform strategy as well as a collection of schools implementing their own plans for increasing student success through family-community-school collaboration. IRE characterizes the League as an alternative approach to educational reform designed to demonstrate the potential effectiveness of a comprehensive, ecological approach to restructuring in which school reform is directly linked to: family support and education; neighborhood social and economic development; integrated services for poor families; and means for family contribution to children's development.

   The efforts of these reform-oriented schools are premised on seven core ideas about a national, multi-site strategy for school reform. These include:

   - a clear ideological focus or framework which asserts that (1) all children can learn and achieve social and academic success, including those children who are considered most "at-risk," and (2) success for all children can only be achieved through the combined and coordinated efforts of school staff, families, and other community agencies and resources
   - a perceived need on the part of participants for substantial change in present policies and practices
   - development of an action plan with appropriate and feasible ways and means to implement the ideology
   - knowledgeable outside help available on a regular basis who will act as consultants to the schools (these persons must have a commitment to the program's ideology and are trained by IRE)
   - recognition and visibility (provided by IRE in conjunction with the League and consisting of co-presentations at national conferences, videoconferences, and dissemination of materials highlighting successful programs)
   - strategies designed to obtain discretionary monies needed to carry out the program
   - assistance from researchers and third-party intervenors who will offer constructive criticism to the project.

3. **Purpose and Goals:** The purpose of this program is to show how family-community-school partnerships can contribute to school restructuring aimed at increasing the academic and social success of all children, especially those labeled "at-risk."

4. **Key Features:** Parental involvement, community involvement, school/community partnerships.

5. **Audience or Participants:** Participants include some 75 schools. The program began in 1990 with a core of 40 urban schools, but participation has expanded to include non-urban districts. A small number of private as well as public schools are also members, as are ten schools in other countries including Australia, Chili, Czechoslovakia, Portugal, and Spain.

6. **Impact:** A component involving research and assessment by third-party intervenors is built into the model at selected sites.

7. **Resources:** IRE offers general information, technical assistance, research reports and other publications, recognition, and opportunities to compete for a variety of grants. IRE publishes a magazine, Equity and Choice, three times a year as well as a newsletter, Connections.

8. **Funding Sources/Costs:** IRE provides a modest amount of direct funding to League participants. However, it does provide information and consultation regarding how to access funding from other sources. IRE activities offered to the League are funded from a variety of foundations. The two largest contributors are the MacArthur Foundation and the Pew Charitable Trusts.

9. **Contact for Further Information:**

Etta Green Johnson, Director
League of Schools Reaching Out
Institute for Responsive Education
605 Commonwealth Avenue
Boston, MA 02215
617-353-3309
617-353-8444 (FAX)

10. **Selected Readings:**

Davies, D. (1992). The League of Schools Reaching Out: A progress report on a collaborative national research and action project about family and community collaboration. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April 20-24, 1992.

Davies, D. (1991). Testing a strategy for reform: The League of Schools Reaching Out. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, April 3-7, 1991.

Davies, D., Burch, P., & Johnson, V. (1991). A portrait of schools reaching out: Report of a survey of practices and policies of family-community-school collaboration. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, Center on Families, Communities, Schools & Children's Learning.

Krasnow, J. (1990). Building parent-teacher partnerships. Prospects from the perspective of the schools reaching out project. Boston: Institute for Responsive Education.

Swap, S. M. (1990). Schools reaching out and success for all children: Two case studies. Boston: Institute for Responsive Education.

Zeldin, S. (1990). Organizational structures and interpersonal relations: Policy implications for schools reaching out. Boston: Institute for Responsive Education.

LEARNING TOMORROW*

1. **Sponsor(s):** National Foundation for the Improvement of Education

   Grade Level: Varies depending upon the site, but there are some district-wide efforts.

2. **Overview:** The National Foundation for the Improvement of Education (NFIE), a non-profit foundation created by the National Education Association, is dedicated to the empowerment of teachers. Its major restructuring effort, Learning Tomorrow, was developed to support and stimulate educational restructuring through innovative use of technology. Rather than attempt a strict definition of restructuring, NFIE developed guideposts that mark the presence of a learning environment engaged in restructuring. They include:

   - a central focus on students' characteristics and individual learning styles rather than on the machinery of technology
   - a concern that technology serve all learners (including at-risk and disabled) to reduce the gap between the information-rich and information-poor
   - students applying their knowledge in purposeful activities that are relevant, practical, and socially valuable (e.g., providing assistance to the community, working with other students on global issues)
   - learning environments which extend beyond the walls of schools, often involving community members and others not traditionally associated with student learning
   - interdisciplinary approaches to curriculum often involving teaming of teachers from different subject matters
   - high teacher expectations and a belief that students are capable of solving complex problems
   - a belief in the importance of using existing and emerging technologies and researching their full potential for supporting education
   - increased students' responsibility for their own and others' learning
   - the application of a mixture of technologies which extend beyond the computer
   - a balance of technology-facilitated and human-facilitated learning
   - flexible use of facilities, time, and human resources

---

*This description is adapted from NFIE's handbook, Images in Action.

- sensitivity to the development, health, and well-being of the whole learner rather than limited to academic development.

Learning Tomorrow is a multi-phase program. The first phases involved the development of guideposts and scenarios describing what teaching and learning should look like in schools of the future. These descriptions were formulated based on input from business and industry leaders, experts in technology, futurists, and educators. Promising school restructuring practices were then identified based on these guideposts.

Learning Tomorrow is now in the grants phase -- offering support to teacher-led teams of educators who are exploring the role of technology in restructuring schools. The grants phase is being implemented on a regional basis with selected sites currently located in 16 states.

3. **Purpose and Goals:** Learning Tomorrow is designed to support and stimulate educational restructuring through innovative use of technology.

4. **Key Features:** Students as problem-solvers; cooperative learning; teachers as mentors and coaches; shared decisionmaking; use of technology to improve learning.

5. **Audience or Participants:**

Participants are 38 schools in 21 states including:

- Alaska
- Alabama
- California
- Connecticut
- Florida
- Georgia
- Indiana
- Kentucky
- Louisiana
- Massachusetts
- Maryland
- Maine
- Michigan
- Minnesota
- Missouri
- Mississippi
- North Carolina
- New York
- South Carolina
- Tennessee
- Virginia

6. **Impact:** Programs identified through this process emphasize traditional approaches as well as alternative approaches to student assessment such as the use of portfolios. Impact of the entire program has not yet been assessed.

7. **Resources:** NFIE supports grant programs, offers assistance in project development, and publishes materials on school restructuring. Written materials include the following:

- Images of Potential, book
- Images in Action: Linking Technology and Restructuring, handbook,
- "A New Culture of Learning: Activating Change," paper.

8. **Funding Sources/Costs:** Apple Computer, Inc. provided funding for the Images in Action publication. The Hitachi Foundation supported the first stages of Learning Tomorrow as well as provided recognition grants to the first 38 participating schools. The grants phase is being implemented on a regional basis and is funded by the following: Pacific Telesis and IBM in California; NYNEX Foundation, New England Telephone, and Southern New England Telephone in the northeast; and Bell South Foundation with assistance from IBM in the southeast. NFIE is exploring the expansion of the Learning Tomorrow Program in other regions of the United States.

9. **Contact for Further Information:**

Donna C. Rhodes
Executive Director
National Foundation for the Improvement of Education
1201 16th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036
202-822-7840
202-822-7779 (FAX)

10. **Selected Readings:**

Christa McAuliffe Institute for Educational Pioneering. (1990). A new culture of learning: Activating change. Washington, DC: National Foundation for the Improvement of Education.

National Foundation for the Improvement of Education. (1987). A blueprint for success: Operation rescue. Washington, DC: Author.

National Foundation for the Improvement of Education. (1987). The components of community mobilization. Washington, DC: Author.

THE LEARNING LABORATORIES INITIATIVE*

1. **Sponsor(s):** NEA National Center for Innovation**

   Grade Level: District-wide

2. **Overview:** The NEA Learning Laboratories are district-wide programs that aim to restructure significantly how learning takes place. How this is carried out varies from site to site, although there are some unifying themes such as: high levels of cooperation between teachers and senior district administrators; active involvement of teachers in program design and implementation; teacher involvement in classroom, administrative, and policy decisions; encouragement of experimentation and innovation district-wide; promotion of great parent and community involvement; and an emphasis upon student learning.

   The selection process involves NEA state affiliates identifying possible Learning Laboratory sites and helping to develop Learning Laboratory applications. State affiliates may nominate only one district for designation as the NEA Learning Laboratory for their state. NEA's goal is to identify one Learning Laboratory in each state which would serve as a flagship project for other districts. Thus far, 20 sites have been selected. Projects are selected to reflect the diversity which exists across the nation.

3. **Purpose and Goals:** Each school district participating in the Learning Laboratory initiative is committed to the goal of ensuring that every child reaches his/her full learning potential each and every day.

4. **Key Features:** Shared decisionmaking; decentralized structure; community involvement; focus on staff development with greatly expanded resources.

5. **Audience or Participants:**

   - Asheboro, NC
   - Bellevue, WA
   - Bonny Eagle, ME
   - Chaska, MN
   - Chickasha, OK
   - Dickinson, ND
   - Greece, NY
   - Greensburg-Salem, PA
   - Jefferson County, KY
   - Jefferson County, WV
   - Marshalltown, IA
   - Memphis, TN
   - Mendon, MI
   - Millard, NB
   - Nashoba, MA
   - Paulding County, GA
   - Pinellas County, FL
   - Ravenna, OH
   - Tempe, AZ
   - Westerly, RI

---

*This description is adapted from NEA's brochure, NEA Center for Innovation.

**Also see the entry for the NEA National Center for Innovation in the National Restructuring Centers section (Part II) of this document.

6. **Impact:** Varies depending upon the site.

7. **Resources:** NEA will assist in the growth, development, and success of each Learning Laboratory by providing wide-ranging support including: current educational research; a specially-designed computer network; assistance in documenting, assessing, and disseminating program information; and assistance from top educational analysts and classroom practitioners.

   The following materials are also available from NEA.

   - Building the Future, program brochure (Free)
   - NEA Center for Innovation, brochure (Free)
   - The NEA Learning Laboratories Initiative: Site Descriptions (Free)
   - Doubts and Certainties, a newsletter from the NEA Center for Innovation.

8. **Funding Sources/Costs:** Varies depending upon the site.

9. **Contact for Further Information:**

   Robert Barkley, Director
   Learning Laboratories Initiative
   National Education Association
   National Center for Innovation
   1201 16th Street, NW
   Washington, DC 20036
   202-822-7370
   202-822-7987 (FAX)

10. **Selected Readings:**

Barkley, R., & Castle, S. (1993). Principles and actions: A framework for systemic change. Washington, DC: NEA National Center for Innovation.

Lawrence, L., & Foyle, H. C. (1990). Cooperative grouping for interactive learning: Students, teachers, and administrators. Washington, DC: National Education Association.

National Education Association. (1990). Business and the reshaping of public education. Washington, DC: Author.

Livingston, C., & Castle, S. (1989). Teachers and research in action. Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Presseisen, B. Z. (Ed.). (1988). At-risk students and thinking: Perspectives from research. Washington, DC and Philadelphia: National Education Association and Research for Better Schools.

Watts, G. D., & Castle, S. (1992). The time dilemma in school restructuring. Washington, DC: NEA National Center for Innovation.

RE:LEARNING

1. **Sponsor(s):** Coalition of Essential Schools (CES), the Education Commission of the States (ECS), and participating states.*

   Grade Level: Primarily high school, junior high school, and/or middle school. Some work is done in elementary schools in selected states.

2. **Overview:** Re:Learning was established in 1988 as the result of a joint effort between the Coalition of Essential Schools (CES) and the Education Commission of the States (ECS). Re:Learning was created to provide state-based support networks which would assist schools interested in implementing the nine common principles of CES as initiated by Ted Sizer.

   Re:Learning places a number of conditions on both states and schools which must be met before they can officially be recognized as Re:Learning states/schools. These pre-conditions involve a state commitment to allocate time (five years), dollars, staff, and a leadership structure that will support the implementation of CES' nine common principles in at least ten schools in a given state. At the district/school level, a school's faculty must choose to participate in Re:Learning. The district must also commit the time, staff, and resources needed to engage in extensive study, planning, development, and implementation to redesign the school or district based on CES' principles over a multi-year period.

3. **Purpose and Goals:** The overall purpose of Re:Learning is to bring participants at all levels of the educational system -- from the school house to the state house -- into the CES conversation and change process to the end of redesigning schools to help all students to use their minds well. The goals of Re:Learning are to provide (a) a centralized structure for disseminating CES' ideas and philosophy, and (b) state-based support networks to assist schools with implementation.

4. **Key Features:** Student mastery of a limited number of essential skills and knowledge; teachers as coaches; personalized teaching and learning; site-based instructional decisionmaking; diplomas awarded based on exhibition of students' mastery of the school program.

5. **Audience or Participants:** Over 300 schools in ten states are involved in the Re:Learning effort. These states include:

   - Arkansas
   - Colorado
   - Delaware
   - Illinois
   - Indiana
   - Maine
   - New Mexico
   - Pennsylvania
   - Rhode Island
   - South Carolina

---

*For more details regarding this partnership, see the entry for Coalition of Essential Schools in the National Restructuring Programs section (Part I) and the entry for Education Commission of the States in the National Restructuring Agencies section (Part III) of this document.

6. **Impact:** Varies depending upon the state.

7. **Resources:** Resources available to program participants include state-sponsored Re:Learning workshops, TREKS, meetings, and sharing networks. In addition, CES and ECS have designated several staff to provide specific support to state Re:Learning activities. Each state also has a Re:Learning state coordinator. CES and ECS co-sponsor an annual three-day conference, the "Fall Forum."

   Among the materials available are various periodicals, working papers, recommended readings, and research reports detailed in the CES publications list. Also available, specific to Re:Learning sites, are:

   - Re:Learning Handbook - Part I, Overview (July 1989)
   - Re:Learning Handbook - Part II, Getting Started (July 1989)
   - Inside Re:Learning, a free newsletter
   - Focusing on Re:Learning, report
   - Focusing on Re:Learning (video cassettes to accompany report; 1989).

8. **Funding Sources/Costs:** The cost of Re:Learning varies by school site. States have typically provided each of their Re:Learning sites with $3,000 to $25,000 seed money annually to rethink and modify their educational programs and practices. Districts typically provide matching funds.

9. **Contact for Further Information:**

   Lois Easton, Director
   Re:Learning System
   Education Commission of the States
   707 17th Street, Suite 2700
   Denver, CO 80202
   303-299-3600
   303-296-8332 (FAX)

10. **Selected Readings:**

Baca, P., Anderson, B., & Arnsparger, A. (1989). Focus on Re:Learning. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.

Pennsylvania Department of Education, Pennsylvania Academy for the Profession of Teaching, Pennsylvania Cycle I Re:Learning Schools, & Research for Better Schools. (1990). Re:Learning in Pennsylvania: A resource book. Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools.

Special issue: The Re:Learning initiative. (1992). NASSP Bulletin, 76(541).

SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM*

1. **Sponsor(s):** Yale Child Study Center

   Grade Level: Elementary, middle, and high school

2. **Overview:** In 1968, James Comer began the School Development Program (SDP) as a collaborative effort between the Yale Child Study Center and the New Haven School District. This initiative incorporates collaborative decisionmaking and site-based management with parent and mental health team activities emphasizing child development, parent involvement, and action research.

   Parents, administrators, faculty, and mental health professionals together assume responsibility for administering the SDP. Each school establishes its own governance and management team, which designs a comprehensive building plan to address school climate, curriculum, assessment, and staff development. A mental health team at each SDP school advises teachers and works to identify and prevent behavior problems. In addition, each school has a parent participation program and teachers attend regular inservice workshops on issues related to the SDP.

   All of the adults who come into contact with students serve as models of desirable behaviors and attend to students' psychosocial and academic needs. In addition to serving on the governance and management team, parents may work as volunteers in classrooms and other areas of the school and participate in a variety of school activities.

3. **Purpose and Goals:** The School Development Program is based on five beliefs. They are that:

   - The elementary school is where children develop the skills, attitudes, and habits that influence their achievement for the remainder of their lives.
   - All children can learn regardless of their background.
   - The sources of most learning and behavior problems are conflicts between the backgrounds and experiences that children bring to school and the expectations or values of schools.
   - Excellent schools require a climate of trust, cooperation, and caring among teachers, students, parents, and the community.
   - Students understand concepts best when they experience them.

---

*Portions of this description are excerpted from: Education Commission of the States. (1991). Restructuring the education system: A consumer's guide, Vol. 1. Denver: Author.

The goals of this program are fourfold. They include:

- addressing the causes, as well as the symptoms, of student failure
- supporting the physical, emotional, and intellectual growth of all students
- bridging the gap that occurs when the attitudes, values, and behaviors children develop at home are different from those valued at school
- creating a structured, predictable school environment in which faculty and parents communicate clear expectations for behavior and academic performance.

4. **Key Features:** Collaborative decisionmaking; consensus; parent involvement; community involvement; emphasis on child development; and action research.

5. **Audience or Participants:** Over 25 school districts have adopted this program in the following states:

- Alaska
- California
- Connecticut
- District of Columbia
- Florida
- Illinois
- Kansas
- Louisiana
- Maryland
- Massachusetts
- Michigan
- New Hampshire
- New Jersey
- New York
- North Carolina
- Ohio
- Pennsylvania
- Texas
- Virginia
- Washington

6. **Impact:** The New Haven schools in which this program was first developed were ranked worst in the city on achievement test scores, staff morale, and attendance 20 years ago. Today they consistently rank among the top four schools in the city in these areas. Numerous studies conducted by the Yale Child Study Center show that the School Development Program has demonstrated:

- positive effects on school climate and student outcomes
- higher self-concept ratings by students
- reduction in absenteeism and the number of suspension days
- increased scores in reading, math, and the total battery on the California Achievement Test
- increased parental involvement.

7. **Resources:** Various materials regarding the program as well as training and technical assistance are available through the Yale Child Study Center.

30

8. **Funding Sources/Costs:** The initial program was begun with a grant from the Ford Foundation. The Rockefeller Foundation now funds this effort. Costs of program implementation in other schools are thought to be minimal since existing personnel are used.

9. **Contact for Further Information:**

James Comer
Yale Child Study Center
P.O. Box 3333
230 S. Frontage Road
New Haven, CT 06510
203-785-2548
203-785-3359 (FAX)

10. **Selected Readings:**

Anson, A. R., Cook, T. D., Habib, F., Grady, M. K., Haynes, N., & Comer, J. P. (1991). The Comer school development program: A theoretical analysis. Urban Education, 26, 56-82.

Brandt, R. S. (1986). On improving achievement of minority children: A conversation with James Comer. Educational Leadership, 43(5), 13-17.

Comer, J. P. (1988). Maggie's American dream. New York: Plume Books.

Comer, J. P. (1987). New Haven's school community connection. Educational Leadership, 44, 13-16

Comer, J. P. (1980). School power: Implications of an intervention project. New York: Free Press.

Comer, J. P., Haynes, N. M., & Hamilton-Lee, M. (1987). School power: A model for improving black student achievement. Urban League Review, 11(1-2).

Gursky, D. (1990). A plan that works. Teacher Magazine, 1(9), 46-54.

Holdren, J. (1989). A process that works. Basic Education, 33(6), 8-11.

O'Neill, K., & Shoemaker, J. (Eds). (1989). A conversation between James Comer & Ronald Edmonds: Fundamentals of effective school improvement. Dubuque, IA: National Center for Effective Schools Research and Development.

Payne, C. (1991). The Comer intervention model and school reform in Chicago: Implications of two models of change. Urban Education, 26, 8-24.

THE STANFORD ACCELERATED SCHOOLS PROJECT

1. **Sponsor(s):** Stanford University

   Grade Level: Elementary and middle school grades

2. **Overview:** The Accelerated Schools model was designed as a system-wide approach to educational reform. The research underlying this model began from a project initiated at Stanford University in the early 1980's which addressed educational outcomes of students in at-risk situations in light of school improvement efforts. The program began in two schools during 1986-87. Over 300 schools have now adopted this model.

   Full implementation of the program takes about six years and includes:

   - establishing a unity of purpose among staff, students, parents, and the community
   - identifying and building on the strengths of students, staff, parents, and community members
   - creating the capacity for school-site decisions regarding organization, instruction, and curriculum
   - establishing a problem-solving process for making informed decisions
   - changing the way resources are allocated within school districts from allocating funds to pull-out programs (not including those serving children with severe impairments) to investing in overall programs that involve all children in a faster-paced, more engaging curriculum
   - freeing up time for staff to discuss, plan, make decisions, and explore alternatives
   - decreasing the emphasis on compliance with "top-down" rules, regulations, and mandates.

   The Accelerated Schools involve staff, students, parents, and community members at three levels:

   - in cadres, or work groups, that focus on specific issues or school concerns
   - on the steering committee, which coordinates efforts of the cadres and brings recommendations to the school as a whole
   - at meetings of the school-as-a-whole, which acts as the decisionmaking body of the school.

   Prior to training, the school community members sign a letter of commitment that clarifies goals of the Accelerated Schools and identifies obligations of parents, faculty, and students in achieving them.

Lessons use a language-based approach and emphasize analysis, synthesis, problem-solving, and practical application. Active learning techniques such as peer tutoring and cooperative learning are used and students often work on projects requiring resources outside the classroom.

3. **Purpose and Goals:** The program's underlying philosophy is that:

   - The schools we want for our own children should be the schools we want for all children.
   - All children can learn.
   - Schools should accelerate (enrich), not remediate, students.
   - Students in at-risk situations often show talents and strengths in areas not traditionally valued in school and possess knowledge unique to their cultures.
   - Students in at-risk situations must learn at faster rates than their more advantaged peers to eliminate the achievement gap that exists between them.
   - Many conventional school practices, such as tracking or ability grouping, teacher-dominated instruction, and standardized testing, fail to empower all students to learn to their full capacities.

   The goals of the program are to:

   - enable students in at-risk situations to benefit from mainstream education
   - bring disadvantaged students into the educational mainstream by the end of 6th grade and to build upon their experiences in the secondary grades
   - close the gap in standardized test scores and grade-level promotion between at-risk and more advantaged students
   - teach all students using a gifted and talented approach.

4. **Key Features:** Active learning techniques such as peer tutoring and cooperative learning; parental involvement; language-based approach for all subjects; heterogeneous classes; shared decisionmaking regarding teaching and learning, governance, budget, and school policy.

5. **Audience or Participants:** Over 300 schools in the following states have adopted the Accelerated Schools model:

   - Arizona
   - California
   - Colorado
   - Connecticut
   - Florida
   - Georgia
   - Illinois
   - Louisiana
   - Massachusetts
   - Michigan

- Minnesota
- Missouri
- Nevada
- New Jersey
- New Mexico
- New York
- Oregon
- Pennsylvania
- South Carolina
- Texas
- Utah
- Washington
- Wisconsin

6. **Impact:** Program impact is gauged by student performance on standardized tests, portfolios of student work, student and staff attendance, parental participation, and reductions in student transfers. For each area of the curriculum, students take achievement tests and undergo periodic evaluations and assessments by school staff. Members of the community spend time on reflection and assessment of the school's success in transforming itself into an accelerated school.

7. **Technical Assistance and Other Available Resources:** The Accelerated Schools Project produces a newsletter, "Accelerated Schools," three times a year, and has compiled a list of written and audiovisual materials available to schools and practitioners. Some of the materials currently available include:

   - "Accelerated Schools for At-Risk Children," a videotape
   - "Accelerated Schools After Three Years," a paper
   - "Accelerated Schools: A New Strategy for At-Risk Students," a paper.

   The papers and videotape are free of charge, but those requesting the videotape are expected to copy it and then send it back to the Stanford office.

8. **Funding Sources/Costs:** It is estimated that this effort costs approximately $30 per pupil per year in addition to normal expenses. Most of the funding for staff development comes from existing school budgets, with some monies derived from grants from local foundations. A grant from Chevron, USA supports publication of the "Accelerated Schools" newsletter, as well as other activities of the National Center for the Accelerated Schools Project at Stanford University.

9. **Contact for Further Information:**

   Henry M. Levin, Director
   National Center for the Accelerated Schools Project
   109 CERAS/School of Education
   Stanford University
   Stanford, CA 94305-3084
   415-725-1676
   415-723-7578 (FAX)

10. **Selected Readings:**

Hopfenberg, W. S., Levin, H. M., Meister, G. R., & Rogers, J. (1990). Accelerated schools. Stanford, CA: Stanford University.

Hopfenberg, W. S., Levin, J. M., Meister, G. R., & Rogers, J. (1990). Toward accelerated middle schools. Stanford, CA: Stanford University.

Levin, H. M. (1991). Accelerating the progress of all students. Rockefeller Institute Special Report Number 31. Albany, NY: State University of New York at Albany, Nelson A. Rockefeller Institute of Government.

Levin, H. M. (1990). At-risk students in a yuppie age. Educational Policy, 4, 283-295.

Levin, H. M. (1989). Financing the education of at-risk students. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 11(1), 47-60.

Levin, H. M. (1988). Accelerated schools for at-risk students. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University, Center for Policy Research.

Levin, H. M. (1987). Accelerated schools for the disadvantaged. Educational Leadership, 44(6), 19-21.

Levin, H. M. (1987). New schools for the disadvantaged. Teacher Education Quarterly, 14(4), 60-83.

Levin, H. M., & Hopfenberg, W. S. (1991). Don't remediate: Accelerate! Principal, 70(3), 11-13.

Meister, G. R. (1991). Assessment in programs for disadvantaged students: Lessons from accelerated schools. Washington, DC: U.S. Congress, Office of Technology Assessment.

Richardson, R. B. (1988). Active affective learning for accelerated schools. Stanford, CA: Center for Educational Research.

SUCCESS FOR ALL*

1. **Sponsor(s):** Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students, The Johns Hopkins University

   Grade Level: Elementary

2. **Overview:** First implemented as a pilot during the 1987-88 school year, the Success for All program grew out of a partnership between the Baltimore City Public Schools and the Center for Research in Elementary and Middle Schools (CREMS) at Johns Hopkins University. The initial purpose of the program was to enable every child in an inner-city Baltimore elementary school to perform at grade level by the end of grade 3. Each Success for All school has a program facilitator who coordinates schedules and activities and has up to six reading tutors who work individually with students. A Family Support Team, made up of staff including social workers, parent liaisons, and counselors, educates and assists families in matters related to school readiness, such as attendance, health, and nutrition.

   The program usually provides half-day preschool and full-day kindergarten. Preschool and kindergarten classes emphasize oral language, thematic units, and story telling while the reading curriculum focuses on oral language, comprehension, and word-attack skills. Students in grades 1, 2, and 3 are grouped together for much of the school day and are regrouped for 90-minute reading periods each day. Success for All uses cooperative learning strategies. Students who lack a sufficient grasp of certain materials receive one-to-one tutoring by trained adults. Reading teachers assess each student's progress every eight weeks to develop an academic plan for him/her and to determine whether he/she needs tutoring, health screening, or other services.

   Teachers take the lead in designing innovative approaches to improve achievement and assume responsibility for student learning. The program facilitator helps the principal with scheduling, frequently visits classes and tutoring sessions, and coordinates the activities of the Family Support Team with instructional staff.

3. **Purpose and Goals:** Underlying this program are the beliefs that:

   - Every child can learn.
   - Success in early grades is critical for future success in school.

---

*Portions of this description are excerpted from: Education Commission of the States. (1991). Restructuring the education system: A consumer's guide, Vol. 1. Denver: Author.

- Prevention, early intervention, improved classroom methods, individual attention, family support, and other strategies must be used to address problems students have both inside and outside the classroom.

- The most widely used strategies for disadvantaged students, remedial "pull-out" programs, don't work.

- Effective school reform programs are both comprehensive, intensive, and relentless.

The goals of this program are to:

- ensure that every student will perform at grade level in reading, writing, and mathematics by the end of the 3rd grade

- reduce the number of students referred to special education classes

- reduce the number of students who are held back to repeat a grade

- increase attendance.

4. **Key Features:** Cooperative learning strategies; reading tutors who work individually with students; cross-grade regrouping for reading; emphasis upon family interaction.

5. **Audience or Participants:** Several schools in the following cities have adopted the programs.

- Baltimore, MD
- Philadelphia, PA
- Charleston, SC
- Montgomery, AL
- Memphis, TN
- Rockford, IL
- Ft. Wayne, IN
- Witchita Falls, TX
- Modesta, CA
- Phoenix, AZ
- San Francisco, CA
- Dade County, FL
- Chicago, IL
- Yonkers, NY
- Elizabeth, NJ
- Camden, NJ
- Caldwell, ID

6. **Impact:** An Advisory Committee (program facilitator, teacher representatives, a social worker, and Johns Hopkins research staff) meets weekly to review program progress. In addition, research scientists have conducted a series of assessments that indicate significant improvement in the test scores of students, especially those whose pretests place them in the lowest quarter of their grades. Retentions and special education placements have also been significantly reduced.

7. **Resources:** In-service training programs, materials, newsletters, and reports are available.

8. **Funding Sources/Costs:** Success for All receives Chapter 1 funding, plus financial support from the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement. Most schools who receive school-wide Chapter 1 funds can mount the program. Some additional start-up funds (less than $25,000) may be necessary.

11. **Contact for Further Information:**

Robert Slavin or Lawrence Dolan
Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students
The Johns Hopkins University
3505 N. Charles Street
Baltimore, MD 21218
410-338-7570
410-338-6370 (FAX)

12. **Selected Readings:**

Brandt, R. (1988). On research and school organization. A conversation with Bob Slavin. Educational Leadership, 46(2), 22-29.

Madden, N. A., Slavin, R. E., Karweit, N. L., Dolan, L., & Wasik, B. A. (In press). Neverstreaming: Prevention and early intervention as an alternative to special education. Journal of Learning Disabilities.

Madden, N. A., Slavin, R. E., Karweit, N. L., Dolan, L., & Wasik, B. A. (1992). Success for all: Longitudinal effects of a restructuring program for inner-city elementary schools. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students.

Madden, N. A., Slavin, R. E., Karweit, N. L., Dolan, L., & Wasik, B. A. (1991). Success for All: Multi-year effects of a schoolwide elementary restructuring program. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University.

Madden, N. A., Slavin, R. E., Karweit, N. L., Dolan, L., & Wasik, B. A. (1991). Success for All. Phi Delta Kappan, 72(8), 594-599.

Madden, N. A., Slavin, R. E., Karweit, N. L., & Livermore, B. J. (1989). Restructuring the urban elementary school. Educational Leadership, 46(5), 14-18.

Madden, N. A., Stevens, R. J., & Slavin, R. E. (1986). A comprehensive cooperative learning approach to elementary reading and writing: Effects on student achievement. Baltimore: Center for Research on Elementary and Middle Schools.

McPartland, J. M., & Slavin, R. E. (1990). Increasing achievement of at-risk students at each grade level. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Slavin, R. E., Karweit, N. L., & Madden, N. A. (1989). Effective programs for students at risk. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Slavin, R. E., Leighton, M., & Yampolsky, R. (1990). Success for All: Effects on the achievement of limited English proficient children. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University, Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students.

Slavin, R. E., Madden, N. A., Karweit, N. L., Dolan, L. J., & Wasik, B. A. (1992). Success for all: A relentless approach to prevention and early intervention in elementary schools. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.

Slavin, R. E., Madden, N. A., Karweit, N. L., Livermore, B. J., & Dolan, L. (1990). Success for All: First-year outcomes of a comprehensive plan for reforming urban education. American Educational Research Journal, 27(2), 255-278.

Slavin, R. E., & Yampolsky, R. (1991). Success for all: Effects on language minority students. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students.

PART II

NATIONAL RESTRUCTURING CENTERS

This section of the sourcebook identifies and describes national restructuring centers. The centers were selected because their entire mission is dedicated exclusively to school restructuring as they have defined it.

Each of these descriptions contains an overview of the center including where available; the center's definition of restructuring; a statement of the center's mission and goals; a listing of available resources; a listing of funding sources; the name, address, and telephone number of a contact person within the center; and a list of selected readings.

CENTER FOR LEADERSHIP IN SCHOOL REFORM

1. **Sponsor(s):** The Center for Leadership in School Reform (CLSR)

2. **Overview:** Founded by Phillip C. Schlechty in 1988, CLSR is a not-for-profit corporation with headquarters in Louisville, KY. CLSR's vision for education is that schools should be organized around students and the work students are expected to do, and communities should be organized to guarantee each child the support needed to be successful in school and the community.

   The basic strategy employed by CLSR is to develop and nurture partnerships with school districts in which the leadership shares the vision that CLSR promotes. Once such partnerships are established, the intent is for the school district and CLSR to work collaboratively to develop and implement programs and procedures that will lead to the realization of the vision in the context of the local school district.

   CLSR bases its work on the following beliefs:

   - The purpose of schools is to develop in each student the capacity to think and reason and use one's mind well, and to ensure that each student develops those understandings, skills, and habits of mind that make it possible to participate fully in the life of a multi-ethnic, multi-cultural society operating in the context of an information-based global economy.

   - Every student can and will learn if presented with the right opportunity to do so. Schools serve their purpose when they invent learning opportunities for students that ensure that each day each child experiences success in school.

   - Learning opportunities are determined by the nature of the work students are assigned or are encouraged to undertake. It is the responsibility of teachers and administrators to ensure that students are provided with those forms of school work at which they are most likely to experience success and from which they learn those things of most value to them, to the community, and to the society at large.

   - It is the obligation of the family and/or the community to guarantee each child the support he or she needs to be successful in pursuing substantial, intellectually demanding tasks and activities.

   - The work of people in an information-based society is best characterized as "knowledge work," by which is meant employing ideas, concepts, symbols, and abstractions to solve problems, produce products, deliver services, or otherwise provide some useful outcome. If schools are to serve such a society well, then schools must become knowledge-work organizations; they must be organized to encourage children to use knowledge to solve problems rather than passively absorb knowledge to be used at some other time.

- Students, and the work students are expected to do, should be the focus of all school activity. Schools should, therefore, be organized around the work of students rather than around the work of teachers and administrators or the particular interests of school boards, political factions, and interest groups.

- The rules, roles, and relationships that govern behavior in schools should be such that: teachers are encouraged to invent work that responds to the needs of the students they serve and are empowered to lead students in the doing of that work; and principals are encouraged to be leaders of leaders, so that all who work in and around schools are accountable for the quality of work provided to students and committed to the continuous improvement of the quality of the work provided.

- The primary role of the superintendent is to educate the community about education, to promote the articulation and persistent pursuit of a compelling vision, to develop leadership capacity at all levels of the system, and to ensure that results -- rather than programs -- dominate the attention of all.

- The mission of district-level administrators and staff is to give direction to and support for the work of schools. It is the obligation of the superintendent, the board of education, central office administrators and staff, and members of the community to provide teachers, principals, and students with conditions and forms of support that ensure optimal performance and continuing growth and development.

- Commitments to innovation and continuous growth and improvement should be expected of all people and programs supported by school district resources. School district resources should be allocated thoughtfully, purposefully, and flexibly to ensure that these expectations can be met.

3. **Mission and Goals:** The mission of CLSR is to promote and support fundamental restructuring of public school systems. All partnership agreements signed by CLSR and a school district call on both parties to commit themselves to pursuing the following goals based upon CLSR beliefs.

   - to develop a shared understanding of the nature of the problems that give rise to the need for fundamental reform in our schools

   - to develop within the local context a compelling vision of what schools can be and how schools should be related to the community

   - to develop throughout the system a clear focus on the student as the primary customer of the work of the school and also a clear focus on the needs and expectations of those whose support is needed if students are to be served effectively, e.g., parents, business and civic leaders, opinion makers, and taxpayers generally

   - to develop a results-oriented management system and a quality-focused decisionmaking process that are consistent with the beliefs that guide the system and that ensure that the measures of quality conform with

the requirements of those who provide support to the customers of the schools, especially students, parents, business and civic leaders, and non-parent taxpayers

- to develop a pattern of leadership and decisionmaking within the school district and between the school district and other youth-serving agencies that is consistent with CLSR beliefs

- to develop a policy environment and a management system that foster flexibility and rapid response; that encourage innovative use of time, technology, and space; that encourage novel and improved staffing patterns; and that create forms of curriculum organization that are responsive to the needs of children and youth

- to develop and maintain systems and programs that encourage systematic innovation and the assessment of innovations within the context of a total quality management framework

- to encourage and support the creation of new relationships between and among those agencies and groups that provide service to children and youth in order to ensure that each child has the support needed to succeed in school and in the community

- to ensure continued support for innovative efforts after initial enthusiasms wane, so long as the efforts continue to produce desired results

- to provide systems of training, incentives, and social and political support for those who are committed to the objectives outlined herein and to widen the support for the pursuit of these objectives among all members of the community.

4. Resources: CLSR offers a wide variety of services including consultation, technical assistance, training, and organizational support to facilitate the process of change in local school systems.

   In this regard, CLSR uses six strategies to pursue its goals.

   - CLSR staff prepare and distribute materials, deliver speeches, and conduct seminars.

   - CLSR conducts national institutes designed to enhance the capacity of school districts and their personnel to initiate, support, and sustain fundamental restructuring efforts.

   - CLSR offers workshops in local districts.

   - CLSR engages in long-term consulting relationships with school districts in developing and implementing such strategies as site-based decisionmaking models and in training designed to enhance local restructuring efforts.

- CLSR engages in partnerships with districts and assists these districts in developing a comprehensive plan for restructuring education in a community.

- Where necessary and appropriate, and only after a demonstration of strong commitment to the partnership, CLSR works to pursue whatever forms of support (financial, political, or technical) are necessary to support district-wide reform efforts.

5. **Funding Sources:** CLSR is totally funded by fees and contracts.

6. **Contact for Further Information:**

Phillip C. Schlechty, President
The Center for Leadership in School Reform
950 Breckenridge Lane, Suite 200
Louisville, KY 40207
502-895-1942
502-895-7901 (FAX)

7. **Selected Readings:**

Cole, R. W. (1991-1993). Strategic imperatives to guide school restructuring. Instructional Leader. (A seven-part series beginning in December 1991 and continuing through February 1993.)

Schlechty, P. C. (1992). A new role for school boards. American School Board Journal

Schlechty, P. C. (1992). Creating schools for the 21st century: Practical guidelines for achieving systemwide change on a day-to-day basis (cassette recording). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schlechty, P. C. (1991). Staff development in the 21st century. Journal of Staff Development, 12(1).

Schlechty, P. C. (1991, April 10). Education services as a regulated monopoly. Education Week.

Schlechty, P. C. (1990). Schools for the 21st century: Leadership imperatives for educational reform. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schlechty, P. C., & Cole, R. W. (1992). Teachers as trailblazers. Educational Horizons, 70(3), 135-137.

Schlechty, P. C., & Cole, R. W. (1992). Creating standard-bearer schools. Educational Leadership, 50(3).

Schlechty, P. C., & Cole, R. W. (1991). Creating a system that supports change. Educational Horizons, 69(2), 78-82.

CENTER ON ORGANIZATION AND RESTRUCTURING OF SCHOOLS*

1. **Sponsor(s):** The University of Wisconsin Center for Education Research, School of Education (through a grant from the U.S. Department of Education).

2. **Overview:** The Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools is engaged in a five-year research program (December 1, 1990 - November 30, 1995) to develop new knowledge on how organizational features of schools can be changed to improve education for students. Their research includes syntheses of prior knowledge, new analyses of existing data, and empirical studies of public elementary, middle, and high schools. Studies are conducted by staff at the University of Wisconsin in collaboration with researchers at other universities including Minnesota, Chicago, Michigan, Harvard, Stanford, and Hofstra.

   Thus far, the Center has developed a framework for conceptualizing school restructuring and has launched three activities to describe the nature and scope of school restructuring nationwide: a search for schools that have already made substantial progress in restructuring; an analysis of proposals for bold innovation submitted to the RJR Nabisco "Next Century Schools" program; and a review of several national projects aimed at school restructuring.

3. **Mission and Goals:** The mission of the Center is to study how organizational features of schools can be changed to increase the intellectual and social competence of students. The research program emphasizes restructuring in four areas: (1) the experiences of students in school; (2) the professional life of teachers; (3) the governance, management, and leadership of schools; and (4) the coordination of community resources to better serve educationally disadvantaged students.

   Through syntheses of previous research, analyses of existing data, and new empirical studies of education reform, the Center focuses on six critical questions aimed at elementary, middle, and high schools.

   - How can schooling nurture authentic forms of student achievement?
   - How can schooling enhance educational equity?
   - How can decentralization and local empowerment be constructively developed?
   - How can schools be transformed into communities of learning?
   - How can change be approached through thoughtful dialogue and support rather than coercion and regulation?

---

*This description is adapted from the Center's newsletter, Issues in Restructuring Schools, 1, Fall 1991.

- How can the focus on student outcomes be shaped to serve these five principles?

4. **Resources:**

The Center publishes reports which offer analysis of substantive issues. Reports produced thus far have presented the Center's general framework, discussed innovations which make small group work productive, analyzed Chicago's school reform effort, and presented an analysis of authentic instruction. Future issue reports will deal with topics such as: collaboration for staff empowerment; lessons in equity; creating communities of learning; and structuring collaborations between communities and restructured schools. These issues are distributed free to all persons on the Center's mailing list. Also available from the Center are:

- three briefs per year (Targeted to special audiences such as principals, policymakers, and education writers, these briefs highlight provocative new information, ideas, and development and are distributed free to all persons on the Center's mailing list.)

- Issues in Restructuring Schools, a newsletter published each fall and spring

- a Bibliography on School Restructuring, updated yearly

- occasional papers, reporting results of Center research.

5. **Funding Sources:** The Center is funded through a grant from the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement to the Wisconsin Center for Education Research, School of Education, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

6. **Contact for Further Information:**

Fred M. Newmann, Director or
Gary Wehlage, Associate Director
Center on Organization and Restructuring
of Schools
School of Education
Wisconsin Center for Education Research
University of Wisconsin-Madison
1025 West Johnson Street
Madison, WI 53706
608-263-7575
608-263-6448 (FAX)

7. **Selected Readings:**

Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools. (1991). Does school restructuring make a difference? National center's search for research sites. Madison, WI: Author.

Newmann, F. M. (1991). Linking restructuring to authentic student achievement. Phi Delta Kappan, 72(6), 458-463.

Newmann, F. M. (1990) Beyond common sense in educational restructuring: The issue of content and linkage. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin-Madison, Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools.

Prager, K. (1992). Bibliography on school restructuring, 1992. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin-Madison, Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools.

NATIONAL CENTER FOR RESTRUCTURING EDUCATION, SCHOOLS, AND TEACHING*

1. **Sponsor(s):** The National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools, and Teaching (NCREST) is an independently-operating center housed at Teachers College, Columbia University.

2. **Overview:** NCREST centers its efforts on school restructuring which it defines as creating schools that are learner-centered, knowledge-based, responsible, and responsive. To accomplish this, fundamental and comprehensive changes must be made in school governance, teaching practices, curriculum, parent and community involvement, assessment, and policy.

   NCREST's work builds concrete, detailed knowledge about efforts undertaken in restructuring schools. This knowledge is used to help others in their attempts at change, to begin to build future education programs for school practitioners, and to promote the environmental and policy changes that will nurture and encourage needed structural reforms.

3. **Mission and Goals:** The mission of NCREST is to document, support, connect, and make lasting the many restructuring efforts going on throughout the nation. Its goal, in accomplishing this mission, is to bring together practitioners and researchers; parents, teachers, and students; and policymakers and teacher educators.

4. **Resources:** NCREST sponsors research and documentation along with forums, seminars, conferences, meetings, and work groups addressing school restructuring issues. NCREST also has a network of over 50 affiliates representing school people, teacher educators, policymakers, parents, and community organizers. In its role as convenor and connector, the Center tries to match affiliates' special strengths and unanswered questions with emerging needs and resources.

   Finally, NCREST, in conjunction with the NYC Center for School Reform, publishes a quarterly newsletter, Resources for Restructuring.

5. **Funding Sources:** NCREST is supported by a major grant from the DeWitt Wallace-Reader's Digest Fund. NCREST's work in New York City, through its Center for School Reform, is supported by the Lowenstein Foundation and the Aaron Diamond Foundation. Funding for individual projects has also been provided by the Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement of the Northeast and Islands, the New York Community Trust, and the Fund for New York City Public Education.

---

*This description is adapted from the Center's newsletter, Resources for Restructuring, Winter, 1992.

6. **Contact for Further Information:**

National Center for Restructuring, Education, Schools,
and Teaching
Box 110, Teachers College
Columbia University
New York, NY 10027
212-678-3432
212-678-4170 (FAX)

7. **Selected Readings:**

Darling-Hammond, L. (1992). Standards of practice for learner-centered schools. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College, National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools, and Teaching.

Lieberman, A., Zuckerman, D., Wilkie, A., Smith, E., Barinas, N., & Hergert, L. (1991). Early lessons in restructuring schools: Case studies of schools of tomorrow...today. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College, National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools, and Teaching.

Lieberman, A., Darling-Hammond, L., & Zuckerman, D. (1991). Early lessons in restructuring schools. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College, National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools, and Teaching.

NEA NATIONAL CENTER FOR INNOVATION*

1. **Sponsor(s):** National Education Association

2. **Overview:** Established in 1990, the NEA National Center for Innovation operates a series of national programs with a small planning and development office in Washington, over 70 participating communities, schools, districts, and programs, and a network of hundreds of participating teachers and administrators across the country. The Center has developed four interconnected programs to improve learning opportunities for all school children. These programs are as follows.

   - The Excellence in Action Programs. The Center identifies and disseminates information on a number of ongoing programs that meet persistent school problems effectively.

   - The Mastery in Learning Consortium. As part of a Mastery in Learning Project, the Center targeted selected schools nationwide for intensive support as they developed and demonstrated school-based models of restructuring over a period of five years. The Mastery in Learning Consortium is an offshoot of this project which builds on the research and learning gained and disseminates information about these restructuring efforts.

   - The Learning Laboratories Initiative.** The Center is developing a national network of restructuring school districts.

   - The Teacher Education Initiative. The Center is currently in the process of developing a partnership with several universities in an effort to redesign teacher preparation and induction programs to upgrade the content and process of teacher education and to link them more directly to the staffing needs of schools in the future.

   In addition to these four program areas, and embracing them all, is a focus on the use of technology and networking. The core is the School Renewal Network, a program that enables educator colleagues across the country to share research and practical data, develop special areas of expertise and study, and interact collegially. Also active in the computer network are education researchers, scholars, and theoreticians whose participation adds a profound richness to the collegial community that teachers can join.

   The newest effort of the NEA and the National Center is the bold new partnerships with the Learning Channel to create Teacher TV. This weekly cable production is designed to build connections among classrooms, schools, and communities.

---

*This description is adapted from NEA's brochure, NEA Center for Innovation.

**See the description of the Learning Laboratories Initiative in the National Restructuring Programs section (Part I) of this document.

3. **Mission and Goals:** The National Center for Innovation was established to foster creative and effective school renewal activity nationally by providing leadership in the development of learning communities and by designing, establishing, and supporting experimental school renewal projects. Through its diverse program activities, the Center seeks to promote a favorable societal interest and engagement in the reform of public education and the restructuring of the country's public schools.

   Underlying all the Center's projects are four themes. They include: (1) the fostering of creative risk-taking, and leadership by teachers; (2) encouragement of local experimentation based on a national vision of American public education renewal; (3) the development of other renewal strategies to complement, and ensure the success of, restructuring; and (4) an emphasis upon action research so that the programs not only serve an immediate set of program goals, but also yield data and analysis which can further the national understanding of the very specific issues and challenges in a wide range of school renewal work.

4. **Resources:** In addition to the previously mentioned programs, the Center also hosts an annual symposium for all of its participants and a large selection of school reform innovators; publishes a bi-monthly newsletter, Doubts & Certainties; and conducts periodic meetings of the participants of individual projects.

   Materials available from the Center include:

   - Building the Future, a program brochure
   - NEA Center for Innovation, a brochure
   - The NEA Learning Laboratories Initiative: Site Descriptions.

5. **Funding Sources:** The Center is funded through the National Education Association.

6. **Contact for Further Information:**

   National Education Association
   National Center for Innovation
   1201 16th Street, NW
   Washington, DC 20036
   202-822-7370
   202-822-7987 (FAX)

7. **Selected Readings:**

   Barkley, R., & Castle, S. (1993). Principles and actions: A framework for systemic change. Washington, DC: NEA National Center for Innovation.

   Lawrence, L., & Foyle, H. C. (1990). Cooperative grouping for interactive learning: Students, teachers, and administrators. Washington, DC: National Education Association.

National Education Association. (1990). Business and the reshaping of public education. Washington, DC: Author.

Livingston, C., & Castle, S. (1989). Teachers and research in action. Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Presseisen, B. Z. (Ed.). (1988). At-risk students and thinking: Perspectives from research. Washington, DC and Philadelphia: National Education Association and Research for Better Schools.

Watts, G. D., & Castle, S. (1992). The time dilemma in school restructuring. Washington, DC: NEA National Center for Innovation.

PART III

NATIONAL RESTRUCTURING AGENCIES

This section of the sourcebook identifies and describes agencies that have either sponsored projects and/or developed materials that are relevant to school restructuring efforts. Each entry contains an overview of the agency's restructuring effort; materials available; name, address, and telephone number of a contact person; and a listing of selected readings.

AFT DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ISSUES

1. **Overview:** The American Federation of Teachers (AFT) includes more than 2,000 autonomous locals in the U.S. and abroad. In AFT school districts, teachers, union leaders, and policymakers are seeking solutions aimed at restructuring. Parents, community members, and teachers -- working in a spirit of cooperation -- are searching for new answers in creating structures and environments that energize both school staffs and the student population of schools. While AFT advocates no one model for restructuring, there are some emerging central themes and common approaches such as shared decisionmaking and close cooperation between labor and management in the restructuring process.

   AFT's education-reform agenda focuses on the need for adequate funding for all schools and high standards and expectations for all students. The AFT supports broad "systemic reform" efforts in which every piece of the educational system, including curriculum, assessment, professional development, and teacher education, is aligned toward helping students meet these rigorous standards.

2. **Materials:** The AFT Educational Issues Department promotes its education-reform agenda through means such as:

   - a biennial conference on current issues of educational policy and professional practice
   - QuESTLine, a newsletter for school-reform activists
   - briefing packets on major educational issues
   - technical assistance to affiliates.

   In addition, the department runs the Educational Research and Dissemination program, a network that links AFT members with the latest educational research. Educational Issues Department staff have expertise in topics ranging from at risk children and technology to special education and school governance.

3. **Contact for Further Information:**

   Eugenia Kemble, Director
   Educational Issues
   American Federation of Teachers
   555 New Jersey Ave., NW
   Washington, DC 20001
   202-879-4400
   202-879-4537 (FAX)

4. **Selected Readings:**

American Federation of Teachers, Center for Restructuring. (1990). Selected contract provisions and related programs. Washington, DC: Author.

American Federation of Teachers, Center for Restructuring. (1990). Restructuring and technology. Washington, DC: Author.

American Federation of Teachers, Center for Restructuring. (1990). Proposals and plans for restructuring schools. Washington, DC: Author.

American Federation of Teachers, Center for Restructuring. (1989). School restructuring: Charter schools/Schools within schools. Washington, DC: Author.

ASSOCIATION FOR SUPERVISION AND CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

1. **Overview:** The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD) is a non-political organization consisting of principals, superintendents, teachers, supervisors, parents, and professors. The organization has had an ongoing interest in school restructuring which it defines as "changing the makeup or pattern of school governance, organization, or curriculum."

   In 1988, ASCD selected 18 schools to participate in a Consortium on Restructuring. The purpose of this Consortium was to "develop, implement, and evaluate a school-based restructuring plan." ASCD, with assistance from the Consortium, has also sponsored a number of conferences on school restructuring and has produced a video series on this topic. ASCD also sponsors a Network for Restructured Schools that attempts to link restructured schools by providing a bi-monthly newsletter and assistance by telephone.

2. **Materials:** ASCD produces a variety of materials on school restructuring including the following:

   - Resources for Restructuring Schools, a catalog of materials
   - The Network, a newsletter for restructured schools
   - ASCD Update, ASCD's monthly newsletter
   - Restructuring America's Schools, a 20-minute video and a 45-page Leader's Guide designed to help schools clarify what it means to restructure their approach to teaching and learning
   - Restructuring the High School: A Case Study, a 25-minute documentary videotape providing an in-depth case study of how one school implemented restructuring and a Leader's Guide to stimulate the restructuring discussion in other schools.

3. **Contact for Further Information:**

   (Headquarters)
   Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
   1250 N. Pitt Street
   Alexandria, VA 22314-1453
   703-549-9110
   703-549-3891 (FAX)

(Network for Restructured Schools)
Richard Ackerman or
Chuck Christensen
Center for Field Services and Studies
Read Hall, West Campus, 1 University Avenue
University of Massachusetts
Lowell, MA 01854
508-934-4633
508-934-3002 (FAX)

4. **Selected Readings:**

Curran, A. B. (1991). Visions that guide change: Final report of the ASCD restructuring consortium. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Prasch, J. (1990). How to organize for school-based management. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

THE BUSINESS ROUNDTABLE*

1. **Overview:** The Business Roundtable consists of chief executive officers (CEOs) of member companies who have made a ten-year commitment of personal time and company resources to achieve national goals by producing systemic change in the way teaching and learning are practiced in the nation's elementary and secondary schools. The Roundtable believes that the degree of systemic change needed to achieve the national goals through successful schools must include a commitment to four operating assumptions. These are:

   1. All students can learn at significantly higher levels.

   2. We know how to teach all students successfully.

   3. Curriculum content must lead to higher order skills, and instructional strategies must be those that work.

   4. Every child must have an advocate.

   Other elements essential to successful schools include: performance or outcome-based assessment, rewards for school success and penalties for school failure, a major role for school-based staff in making instructional decisions, emphasis on staff development, a high-quality pre-kindergarten program, health and other social services sufficient to reduce significant barriers to learning, and technology used to raise student and teacher productivity and to expand access to learning.

   Individual Roundtable CEOs and governors have teamed up to institute these components in their state policies. An action plan for each state will be developed. Each plan will be measured against how it contributes to or detracts from these essential components.

   In association with the Aspen Institute, The Business Roundtable has conducted five dialogues involving 11 governors and 30 corporate CEOs. Six Corporate Involvement Seminars are also planned. These seminars, conducted in conjunction with the National Alliance of Business (NAB), are aimed at some 118 corporate executives designated as having a responsibility for interaction with the public education community.

2. **Materials:** The Business Roundtable produces a variety of informational materials and reports.

---

*This description is adapted from The Business Roundtable's 1990 report Essential Components of a Successful Education System.

3. **Contact for Further Information:**

The Business Roundtable
1615 L Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036
202-872-1260

4. **Selected Readings:**

The Business Roundtable. (1990). Essential components of a successful education system. New York: Author.

Fosler, R. S. (1990). The business role in state education reform. New York: Committee for Economic Development.

National Alliance of Business. (1992). Essential components of a successful education system: Putting policy into practice. New York: Author.

National Alliance of Business. (1991). The Business Roundtable participation guide: A primer for business on education. New York: Author.

Wentworth, E. (1992). Agents of change. New York: Author.

CENTER FOR EDUCATIONAL RENEWAL

1. **Overview:** The Center for Educational Renewal was created by John Goodlad in 1985 at the University of Washington to promote the simultaneous renewal of PreK-12 schooling and the education of educators. The first phase of work (1985-1990) included the design and development of the Study for the Education of Educators. The study resulted in numerous reports, articles, and books. (See Selected Readings below.)

   The Center is now working with 15 colleges and universities -- each in turn working in partnerships with local school districts to implement the recommendations which emerged from the study.

2. **Materials:** The work of the Center for Educational Renewal is reported in various ways -- books, articles, speeches, letters, and bulletins.

3. **Contact for Further Information:**

   Roger Soder, Associate Director or
   Joan Waiss, Program Coordinator
   Center for Educational Renewal
   College of Education, DQ12
   University of Washington
   Seattle, WA 98195
   206-543-6230
   206-543-8439 (FAX)

4. **Selected Readings:**

   Goodlad, J. I. (1990). Teachers for our nation's schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

   Goodlad, J. I., Soder, R., & Sirotnik, K. A. (Eds.). (1990). The moral dimensions of teaching. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

   Goodlad, J. I., Soder, R., & Sirotnik, K. A. (Eds.). (1990). Places where teachers are taught. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

CENTER FOR TECHNOLOGY IN EDUCATION*

1. **Overview:** The Center for Technology in Education (CTE) was funded by a five-year grant, awarded in October 1988, from the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement. CTE is housed at the Center for Children and Technology at Bank Street College of Education in New York City and includes four partner institutions: Bolt Beranek and Newman, Inc. and Harvard University, both in Cambridge, MA; Brown University in Providence, RI; and the National Center on Education and the Economy in Rochester, NY.

   The mission of the Center is to study, design, and demonstrate roles that technologies can play in improving student learning and achievement in schools. Its primary goal is to understand how technologies can be integrated into schools and classrooms in ways that deepen students' understanding of curricular content and enhance students' skills of critical thinking, inquiry, and analysis.

   A major thrust of the Center's work involves linking reform and restructuring to learning and technology. The Center's philosophy maintains that if technology is to contribute to qualitative improvement in student learning, there must be changes in both instructional practices and school organization. These changes may involve shifting the balance of instructional practice from knowledge transmission to coaching, modeling, and other techniques that enable students to become learners. Such goals are likely to require various forms of restructuring such as: giving teachers more decisionmaking power, reorganizing the school day so that teachers can plan together, and providing longer class periods so that students may pursue their academic projects uninterrupted.

   Recognizing that many reform initiatives have failed to connect their efforts and agendas to the improvement of learning or to the use of technology, CTE has established several important initiatives that address these issues. One such effort involved a conference for researchers, practitioners, policy analysts, and technology experts co-sponsored with the National Center on Education and the Economy. Here, participants identified productive intersections of restructuring, technology, and students' active learning. Emerging from this conference were a series of papers addressing restructuring for learning with technology. In addition, the CTE works with the Rochester (NY) City School District, the site of a major restructuring effort.

2. **Materials:** CTE produces brochures describing its programs as well as reports and a newsletter.

---

*This description is adapted from the Center's brochure, Center for Technology in Education.

3. **Contact for Further Information:**

Jan Hawkins, Director
Bank Street College of Education, Center for
Children and Technology
Center for Technology in Education
610 West 112th Street
New York, NY 10025
212-875-4400
212-875-4750 (FAX)

4. **Selected Readings:**

Bank Street College of Education, Center for Children and Technology. (1991). Technical reports and working papers: A publication history. New York: Author.

Newman, D. (1991). Technology as support for school structure and school restructuring. New York: Bank Street College of Education, Center for Children and Technology.

Newman, D. (1990). Technology's role in restructuring for collaborative learning. New York: Bank Street College of Education, Center for Children and Technology.

Oxley, D., Vitrial, M. C. (Ed.). (1990). Restructuring neighborhood high schools: The house plan solution. New York: Public Education Association.

Sheingold, K., & Tucker, M. S. (Eds.). (1990). Restructuring for learning with technology. New York: National Center on Education and the Economy and Bank Street College of Education, Center for Children and Technology.

CENTER FOR WORKFORCE PREPARATION AND QUALITY EDUCATION*

1. **Overview:** The Center for Workforce Preparation and Quality Education is an affiliate of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and was established in April of 1990 to mobilize a national grassroots education reform movement. The Center's goals are to:

   - elevate the visibility of business in education reform
   - provide a unifying strategy to mobilize national, state, and local business leaders for educational reform
   - highlight the unique capabilities of state and local chambers of commerce in providing leadership
   - equip chambers with the tools they need to generate action
   - identify and highlight effective techniques, policies, and programs.

   A major part of the Center's role is to develop a common program and message for state and local chambers of commerce to use in helping to achieve educational reform. The Center's mission stresses action rather than studies of educational problems. The Center is in the process of:

   - developing a national campaign to link business, education, and community leaders together, and informing these groups of ways to achieve local reform and stimulate their action
   - identifying the most successful and results-driven education partnership activities and showing chamber executives and business leaders how to get these initiatives underway
   - developing issue papers on promising reform and restructuring initiatives such as core competencies, accountability, alternative teacher certification, job training, human capital investments, and national goals from the viewpoint of what employers need students to learn
   - developing a program which apprises students of the economic benefits of staying in school and obtaining a quality education, and motivates them toward higher education
   - commissioning a regular newsletter which features recommendations on key issues and descriptions of successful practices in education restructuring and workforce preparation
   - developing and maintaining a data base of education contacts in member chambers nationwide.

---

*This description is adapted from the prospectus, Center for Workforce Preparation and Quality Education.

The Center's plan contains six basic elements: (1) orientation to broad, long-term education goals rather than to individual projects, (2) involvement of all groups and persons in decisionmaking, (3) concern for all types of education problems and needs, (4) use of business-like problem-solving techniques, (5) community leadership, and (6) careful coordination of efforts of leaders and groups.

2. **Materials:** Resources available to state and local business leaders include a prospectus on the Center's activities as well as the following:

   - Bridging the Literacy Gap, outlining steps to establish adult workplace literacy programs
   - Education Blueprints, providing over 60 examples of chamber and corporate-led partnership programs
   - Education: Our Nation's Business and Education Reform: A Job for the Grassroots, both supplements to Nation's Business magazine
   - The Business Educationary, to acquaint leaders with terms and jargon
   - Public Attitudes Towards Education and Public Education: Meeting the Needs of Small Business, polls conducted for the Center by the Roper Organization
   - Improving the Business of Education (videotape and manual)
   - Teaching Tomorrow's Workforce (videotape and manual).

3. **Contact for Further Information:**

   Michelle Griffin
   Communications Manager/Grassroots Liaison
   Center for Workforce Preparation and Quality Education
   1615 H Street, NW
   Washington, DC 20062-2000
   202-463-5525
   202-463-5730 (FAX)

4. **Selected Readings:**

   Each of the above.

CONSORTIUM FOR POLICY RESEARCH IN EDUCATION*

1. **Overview:** The Consortium for Policy Research in Education (CPRE) operates two separately-funded but interlinked research centers: The Policy Center and the Finance Center. Both centers are funded by the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Educational Research and Improvement. Members of CPRE are Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey; University of Southern California; Harvard University; Michigan State University; Stanford University; and the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

   The research agenda for both the CPRE Policy Center and the CPRE Finance Center is built around three goals:

   - to focus program and finance policy research on policies that foster high levels of learning for students from a broad range of social and economic backgrounds
   - to conduct research that will lead to greater coherence of state and local program and finance policies that promote student learning
   - to conduct research that will increase the responsiveness of state and local finance and program policies to the diverse needs of students, schools, postsecondary institutions, communities, and states.

2. **Materials:** In addition to conducting research, CPRE publishes reports and briefs on a variety of education issues including school reform. The Consortium sponsors regional policy workshops for state and local policy-makers and publishes CPRE Policy Briefs, a periodic report on issues and research in education policy.

3. **Contact for Further Information:**

   Lynn McFarlane
   Assistant Director for Communications
   Consortium for Policy Research in Education
   Eagleton Institute of Politics
   Rutgers University
   New Brunswick, NJ 08901-1568
   908-932-1393
   908-932-1551 (FAX)
   or
   Lawrence Picus
   CPRE - Finance Center
   University of Southern California
   Waite Philips Hall 901B
   Los Angeles, CA 90089
   213-740-3299
   213-749-2707 (FAX)

---

*This description is adapted from CPRE Policy Briefs, May 1991.

4. **Selected Readings:**

Carnoy, M., & Hannaway, J. (Ed.). (1993). Decentralization and school improvement: Can we fulfill the promise? San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Carnoy, M., & MacDonell, J. (1989). School district restructuring in Sante Fe, New Mexico. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Policy Research in Education.

Clune, W. H., & White, P. A. (1988). School-based management: Institutional variation, implementation, and issues for further research. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Policy Research in Education.

Elmore, R. (Ed.). (1990). Restructuring schools: The next generation of educational reform. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Firestone, W. A., Fuhrman, S. H., & Kirst, M. (1989). The progress of reform: An appraisal of state education initiatives. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Policy Research in Education.

Levin, H. M. (1988). Accelerated schools for at-risk students. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Policy Research in Education.

McDonnell, L. M., & Pascal, A. (1988). Teacher unions and educational reform. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Policy Research in Education and Center for the Study of the Teaching Profession.

White, P. A. (1988). Resource materials on school-based management. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Policy Research in Education.

COUNCIL OF CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS*

1. **Overview:** The Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) is a nationwide non-profit organization of the 57 public officials who head departments of public education in every state, the District of Columbia, the Department of Defense Dependents Schools, and five extra-state jurisdictions. CCSSO seeks its members' consensus on major education issues and expresses their views to civic and professional organizations, to federal agencies, to Congress, and to the public. Through its structure of committees and task forces, the Council responds to a broad range of concerns about education and provides leadership on major education issues.

   CCSSO has established a Resource Center on Educational Equity which provides services designed to achieve equity in education for minorities, women and girls, and for disabled, limited English proficient, and low-income students. The Center is responsible for managing and staffing a variety of CCSSO leadership initiatives to provide better educational services to children and youth at risk.

   For the past several years, CCSSO has centered its work on the assurance of school success for students who have been placed at risk. In 1989, the Council, along with its Center on Educational Equity, adopted as a major initiative the examination of proposals and efforts to restructure schools with respect to their impact on increasing the effectiveness of learning for all students, but particularly for those at risk.

   CCSSO defines restructuring as "the fundamental redesign of the organization and methods of schooling." As part of its restructuring initiative, the Council produced documents to call attention to the critical need for fundamental school change, and to assist states in their efforts to effect such change. These documents provide principles and enabling strategies to direct major redesign of schooling, and also report on current attempts to design and implement new arrangements of schooling and how they might significantly improve learning for all students.

   More recent efforts of the Council have centered on improving the connections between school and employment and restructuring secondary education and its relationship to postsecondary and community resources to provide structured pathways for youth into adulthood. Other efforts have involved redefining notions of "student success" to encompass children's continuing intellectual, physical, emotional and social development, and well-being; and supporting the types of institutional changes that address this broadened notion of student success.

---

*This description is adapted from CCSSO's brochure, Restructuring Schools: A Policy Statement of the Council of Chief State School Officers.

2. **Materials:** CCSSO publishes Concerns, a quarterly newsletter. It also publishes brochures explaining the organization's position on school restructuring, school-to-employment transition, and school and community collaboration.

3. **Contact for Further Information:**

Ms. Cynthia Brown
Council of Chief State School Officers
One Massachusetts Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20001-1431
202-408-5505
202-408-8072 (FAX)

4. **Selected Readings:**

Clark, R. M. (1989). The role of parents in ensuring education success in school restructuring efforts. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.

Council of Chief State School Officers. (1992). Student success through collaboration: A policy statement of the Council of Chief State School Officers on school and community collaboration. Washington, DC: Author.

Council of Chief State School Officers. (1991). Connecting school and employment: A policy statement on school-employment transition. Washington, DC: Author.

Council of Chief State School Officers. (1991). Families in school: State strategies and policies to improve family involvement in education. Washington, DC: Author.

Council of Chief State School Officers. (1990). Voices from successful schools: Elements of improved schools serving at-risk students and how state education agencies can support more local school improvement. Washington, DC: Author.

Council of Chief State School Officers. (1990). Restructuring learning for all students: A policy statement by the Council of Chief State School Officers on improved teaching of thinking. Washington, DC: Author.

Council of Chief State School Officers. (1989). Success for all in a new century: A report by the Council of Chief State School Officers on restructuring education. Washington, DC: Author.

EDUCATION COMMISSION OF THE STATES*

1. **Overview:** Initiated in 1965, the Education Commission of the States (ECS) is a non-profit, interstate compact whose primary purpose is to help governors, state legislators, state education staff officials, and others develop policies to improve the quality of education at all levels.

   ECS's priority issues include embracing diversity, transforming teaching and learning, and promoting change. ECS also has taken an active stand in supporting school restructuring which it defines as changing the fundamentals of education to focus more clearly on the learner and then putting these fundamentals back together in a radically different way. Facets of restructuring include: rebuilding the curriculum and changing the ways we teach; redefining the roles of teachers and staff and the responsibilities of the state; and revitalizing the governance of schools and colleges and systems for accountability.

2. **Materials:** ECS conducts policy research, surveys, and special studies; maintains an information clearinghouse; organizes state, regional, and national forums; and provides technical assistance to states. Some of the materials most relevant to school restructuring include the following:

   - Restructuring the Education System (1992) includes the following three publications:

     - Building Private Sector and Community Support defines reform role of public/private coalitions

     - Creating Visions and Standards to Support Them examines the importance of having a vision for a new education system and presents suggestions on how to use a vision/standard-setting process to move reform forward

     - Bringing Coherence to State Policy describes problems with traditional education reform policy and presents guidelines to creating policy that supports reform.

   - A special fall 1992 State Education Leader issue focuses on restructuring -- who's doing what, what does it all mean.

   - A Consumer's Guide, Volume 1 (1991) answers common questions about restructuring and provides brief overviews of ten national initiatives.

---

*Portions of this description are excerpted from the ECS brochure: "Education Commission of the States: State Leaders Committed to Improving Education" (1990-1991).

- Communicating About Restructuring - Kit (1992) helps educators build support for restructuring in their schools and communities, describes restructuring efforts, and offers suggestions on how to work with the media and anticipate and respond to criticism. An optional workshop is available.

- Schools of Thought (1991) by Rexford G. Brown studies effects of the 1980's school reform policies

3. **Contact for Further Information:**

Education Commission of the States
707 17th Street, Suite 2700
Denver, CO 80202-3427
303-299-3600
303-296-8332 (FAX)

4. **Selected Readings:**

Education Commission of the States. (1991). Exploring policy options to restructure education. Denver, CO: Author.

Education Commission of the States. (1990). Sharing responsibility for success. Denver, CO: Author.

THE HOLMES GROUP*

1. **Overview:** The Holmes Group is a consortium of 95 U.S. universities committed to restructuring programs for educator preparation and conducting research on these programs. Thus far, The Holmes Group has been involved in at least six different types of reform, including:

   - new connections between schools of education and faculty in arts and sciences
   - collaboration between universities and elementary and secondary faculties on educator preparation and research on teaching and learning
   - the rethinking and reconfiguration of professional studies in light of content, structure, and duration
   - internships in the schools for students in education programs
   - institution of Professional Development Schools broadly defined as "real schools committed to organizational and role changes that will enable the integration of preservice education and professional development with innovative practice and research"
   - new organizational partnerships between groups such as universities, schools, businesses, and civic organizations in support of education reform.

   The Holmes Group sponsors an annual national meeting, and has five regional organizations which sponsor meetings, workshops, and conferences for participating universities.

   Current undertakings of The Holmes Group include the Tomorrow's Schools of Education project and The Holmes Scholars Network program. The Tomorrow's Schools of Education project is aimed at producing a vision of what learning opportunities ought to be provided by education schools of the future and how education schools might be structured to most effectively do so. Action recommendations for reform of educator preparation will be included in the report (due in 1994). The Holmes Scholars Network connects scholars of color at member universities around the country, so as to expand the diversity of the pool of candidates for the professoriate in education.

2. **Materials:** The Holmes Group Forum, a publication printed each fall, winter, and spring, is designed to report news about and to stimulate discussion and exchanges of ideas and opinion within The Holmes Group. The Group also produces brochures and reports relevant to its work. A list of publications is available from the national office.

---

*This description is adapted from The Holmes Group report, Tomorrow's Schools: Principles for the Design of Professional Development Schools.

3. **Contact for Further Information:**

The Holmes Group
501 Erickson Hall
East Lansing, MI 48824-1034
517-353-3874
517-353-6393 (FAX)

4. **Selected Readings:**

Blankenship, S., Burton, J. M., Faltis, C., Lodge, N., Rice, R., & Santos, S. L. (nd). Embracing cultural diversity in colleges of education: Minority recruitment and retention project. Salt Lake City, UT: University of Utah, Graduate School of Education.

The Holmes Group. (1991). Toward a community of learning: The preparation and continuing education of teachers. East Lansing, MI: Author.

The Holmes Group. (1990). Tomorrow's schools: Principles for the design of professional development schools. East Lansing, MI: Author.

The Holmes Group. (1989). Work in progress: The Holmes Group one year on. East Lansing, MI: Author.

Hoyt, K. B. (1991). Administrators and teachers express their support, opposition to reform proposals. NASSP Bulletin, 75(534), 67-74.

Kiebard, H. M. (1989). Success and failure in educational reform: Are there historical lessons? East Lansing, MI: The Holmes Group.

Lanier, J. E., & Featherstone, J. (1988). A new commitment to teacher education. Educational Leadership, 46(3), 18-22.

Mitchell, B., & Varner, D. (1990). Demystifying organizational transformation: A poetical look at "tomorrow's schools." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, April 20, 1990.

Powell, A. G. (1988). Holmes' paradox: Early relations between schools and schools of education. East Lansing, MI: The Holmes Group.

Shulman, L. S. (1990). Aristotle had it right: On knowledge and pedagogy. East Lansing, MI: The Holmes Group.

Sykes, G., Judge, H., & Devaney, K. (1992). The needs of children and the education of educators: A background paper for tomorrow's schools of education. East Lansing, MI: The Holmes Group.

Yinger, R. J., & Hendricks, M. S. (1990). An overview of reform in Holmes Group institutions. Journal of Teacher Education, 41(2), 21-26.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

1. **Overview:** The School Restructuring Consortium has two projects: the School Improvement Resources Inquiry USA (SIRIUS-A) Project and the Restructuring Support Service (RSS). The SIRIUS-A Project, a nationwide survey of restructuring schools, was begun by Indiana University in 1989. Funded by the Indiana Department of Education, the goal of the SIRIUS-A Project was to build a data base of concrete examples of actual school restructuring experiences for use by school practitioners and policy-makers. The project defines restructuring as "rethinking the purpose of the school and implementing changes that make the school fundamentally different from its original form." These restructured schools may take many different forms. Consequently, there is no one best model or system.

   To meet this operational definition of restructuring, a restructured school must adhere to the following conditions.

   - It must be evident that the desired effect of the changes is to meet individual student learning needs and thereby increase individual student learning.

   - The changes must affect other parts of the system outside their immediate area of application or domain, and must impact on the school's use of time, technology (material resources), and talent (human resources). In other words, one substantive change will result in changes elsewhere in the system of the school.

   Based on this definition of restructuring, SIRIUS-A Project staff were able to identify and describe some 62 schools. While these schools do not follow a set model, certain general trends were identified. They include: teacher collaboration through team teaching and site-based management; heterogeneous grouping; continuous progress of students based on development pace; integration of disciplines and learning; schools as centers of inquiry; emphasis on personal development of students; mastery learning; building of democratic school communities; and linking schools, homes, and community agencies.

   The RSS (Restructuring Support Service) was formed in 1992 "to enhance the successful restructuring of schools interested in fundamental change." It offers two major types of services: (1) a facilitator or resource person who works with and gives advice to a restructuring team in a school district, and (2) a professional development seminar (either for or not for credit) that uses an apprenticeship format to enhance the capabilities of the members of a restructuring team to conduct a successful restructuring effort. Both services are offered on-site in the school district. The RSS has been working since November 1992 with the Perry-Worth Elementary School in Lebanon, IN and will take on additional schools after refining their facilitation techniques and processes.

2. **Materials:** Indiana University and the Indiana Department of Education have released three reports on the SIRIUS-A Project:

Reigeluth, C. M., Norris, C. A., & Ryan, D. F. (1991). SIRIUS-A: Navigating by the Stars. Report I: Executive Summary. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University, School of Education, School Restructuring Consortium.

Reigeluth, C. M., Norris, C. A., & Ryan, D. F. (1991). SIRIUS-A: Navigating by the Stars. Report II: Synthesis. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University, School of Education, School Restructuring Consortium.

Reigeluth, C. M., Norris, C. A., & Ryan, D. F. (1991). SIRIUS-A: Navigating by the Stars. Report III: Cases. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University, School of Education, School Restructuring Consortium.

3. **Contact for Further Information:**

Charles M. Reigeluth, Project Director
Professor, Instructional Systems Technology
Indiana University
School of Education
Bloomington, IN 47405
812-856-8451
812-856-8239 (FAX)

4. **Selected Readings:**

Norris, C. A., & Reigeluth, C. M. (1991). Themes for change: A look at systemic restructuring experiences. Educational Horizons, 69(2), 90-96.

Reigeluth, C. M., & Garfinkle, R. (Eds.). (1992). A special issue on systemic change in education. Education Technology, 32(11).

INSTITUTE FOR RESPONSIVE EDUCATION

1. **Overview:** The Institute for Responsive Education (IRE) is a non-profit public interest research and advocacy organization created in 1973 to study, promote, and assist citizen participation in educational decision-making and school improvement. IRE's work over the past 13 years has consisted primarily of research studies, publications, conferences, technical assistance, consultation, policy development for state and local education agencies, and advocacy projects sponsored in conjunction with other organizations. Although private and independent, IRE is housed in the School of Education at Boston University.

   A major IRE project is the League of Schools Reaching Out, a program that shows how family-community-school partnerships can contribute to school restructuring aimed at increasing the academic and social success of all children, especially those labeled "at risk," through community outreach. (See the description of the League of Schools Reaching Out in the National Restructuring Programs [Part I] section.)

   IRE provides little direct funding, but offers information, technical assistance, resource materials, recognition, and opportunities to compete for a variety of grants.

2. **Materials:** IRE publishes a number of materials including research reports, a newsletter, and the magazine, Equity and Choice.

3. **Contact for Further Information:**

   Don Davies, President
   Institute for Responsive Education
   605 Commonwealth Avenue
   Boston, MA 02215
   617-353-3309
   617-353-8444 (FAX)

4. **Selected Readings:**

   Brooks, M. B., & Sussman, R. (1990). Involving parents in the schools: How can third-party interventions make a difference? Boston: Institute for Responsive Education.

   Davies, D. (1990). Report of the director of the schools reaching out project. Boston: Institute for Responsive Education.

   Heleen, O. (1990). Schools reaching out: An introduction. Equity and Choice, 6(3), 5-8.

   Jackson, B. (1990). Schools reaching out: The Adolph Ochs School, P.S. 111. Boston: Institute for Responsive Education.

   Krasnow, J. H. (1990). Improving family school relationships: Teacher Research from the schools reaching out project. Boston: Institute for Responsive Education.

Swap, S. A. (1990) Schools reaching out and success for all children. Boston: Institute for Responsive Education.

Zeldin, S. (1990). Organizational structures and interpersonal relations: Policy implications for schools reaching out. Boston: Institute for Responsive Education.

NATIONAL ALLIANCE FOR RESTRUCTURING EDUCATION*

1. **Overview:** The National Alliance for Restructuring Education is a consortium of states and school districts established in 1990 by the National Center on Education and the Economy. The Alliance program is designed to consolidate the gains made in restructuring, develop the tools needed to assure success, and build a technical assistance and support system that will permit Alliance members to use these tools effectively as well as to share what is being learned with others.

   The goal of the Alliance is to raise performance levels for all students dramatically and substantially close the gap between the lowest and highest performers. The Alliance program works to develop and implement improved systems for setting standards, assessing student performance, creating accountability and incentive systems, professionalizing the roles of teachers, decentralizing decisionmaking, managing change, and creating and carrying out strategic plans and staff development programs.

   Thus far, the Alliance involves seven school districts and five states. The school districts include: Dade County, FL; Edgewood, TX; New York, NY; Pittsburgh, PA; Rochester, NY; San Diego, CA; and White Plains, NY. States involved in the Alliance are Arkansas, New York, North Carolina, Vermont, and Washington.

   Priorities of the Alliance include:

   - Student Performance Assessment which includes: the development of a national examination system which incorporates common internationally competitive standards for student performance; a variety of assessment tools for use at the state and local level, each pegged to the common standards; multiple forms of assessment, including portfolios, projects, and performance assessments which are integrally linked to state and local curriculum frameworks, and which measure the acquisition, application, and demonstration of knowledge, skills,and attitudes; and incentives that can effectively motivate all students to exert the effort required to achieve the standards.

   - Organizational Change which involves the development of organizational change strategies that enable states and districts to strategically plan and manage a restructuring effort which, when implemented, results in higher student performance.

   - Accountability and Incentive Systems which involve the development of alternative accountability systems that are focused on student performance rather than regulation of educational inputs or practices, and that provide educators with appropriate incentives and interventions to improve student performance.

---

*Portions of this description are excerpted from: Brandt, R. (1991). On restructuring schools: A conversation with Mike Cohen. Educational Leadership, 48(8), 54-58.

2. **Materials:** The Alliance is currently in the process of developing a number of materials for distribution.

3. **Contact for Further Information:**

Warren Simmons, Acting Co-Director
National Center on Education and the Economy
1341 G Street, NW, Suite 1020
Washington, DC 20005
202-783-3668
202-783-3672 (FAX)

4. **Selected Readings:**

Brandt, R. (1991). On restructuring schools: A conversation with Mike Cohen. Educational Leadership, 48(8), 54-58.

Cohen, M. (1992). Framework for restructuring an education system for high performance. Rochester, NY: National Center on Education and the Economy.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE BOARDS OF EDUCATION

1. **Overview:** The National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE) is a non-profit, private association that represents state and territorial boards of education. The association's primary objectives are to strengthen state leadership in educational policymaking, promote excellence in the education of all students, advocate equality of access to educational opportunity, and assure responsible lay governance of public education.

   NASBE has been involved in several initiatives related to school restructuring. One of these initiatives consisted of the formation of a Rethinking Curriculum Study Group designed in response to state board member concerns that the school reform movement had overlooked a critical component to improve schools -- the content of the curriculum. This study group consisted of 18 state board members who spent six months participating in an ongoing seminar on curriculum that included three meetings, conversations with nationally prominent resource people, readings, and in-state discussions. This group concluded that curriculum, school structure, and instructional practices are inextricably linked and that many of the practices currently in use hinder the improvement of education for students across a broad spectrum of abilities and backgrounds. (See Rethinking Curriculum Report listed under the Materials section below.)

   A second initiative involved NASBE's partnership with the Seattle (WA) Public Schools to restructure the district's ten middle schools. This endeavor was supported with funds from the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation. Initial findings and recommendations for school level, district level, and state level implementation are provided in NASBE reports listed below.

   NASBE's current efforts in restructuring center around linking special education reform with restructured schools. A two-year investigation by NASBE's Study Group on Special Education resulted in the 1992 report Winners All: A Call for Inclusive Schools, which presents a vision of a single education system that includes all children, rather than the current dual systems of special education and general education. Successfully teaching students with disabilities alongside their regular education peers (known as "inclusive" education) requires a different kind of classroom in schools that have been restructured to provide student-centered learning. NASBE's ongoing project focuses on providing recommendations and technical assistance to policymakers, educators, and parents who desire to move their system toward inclusive education.

2. **Materials:** NASBE has published a number of technical reports on school restructuring, including those listed below.

   - Earle, J. (1989). The steps to restructuring: Changing Seattle's middle schools. Alexandria, VA: National Association of State Boards of Education.

   - National Association of State Boards of Education. (1988). Re-thinking curriculum: A call for fundamental reform. Alexandria, VA: Author.

3. **Contact for Further Information:**

National Association of State Boards of Education
1012 Cameron Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
703-684-4000
703-836-2313 (FAX)

4. **Selected Readings:**

National Association of State Boards of Education. (1989). Today's children, tomorrow's survival: A call to restructure schools. Alexandria, VA: Author.

Roach, V. (1992). Winners all: A call for inclusive schools. Alexandria, VA: National Association of State Boards of Education.

Rutherford, F. J., & Ahlgren, A. (1988). Rethinking the science curriculum. In R. Brandt (Ed.), Content of the Curriculum. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Tollifson, J. (1988). A balanced comprehensive art curriculum makes sense. Educational Leadership, 45(4), 18-22.

Tyson-Bernstein, H. (1988). A conspiracy of good intentions: America's textbook fiasco. Basic Education, 45(7), 1-24.

NATIONAL GOVERNORS' ASSOCIATION*

1. Overview: The National Governors' Association (NGA) defines itself as the instrument through which the nation's governors "collectively influence the development and implementation of national policy and apply creative leadership to state issues." The Association's members are the governors of the 50 states, the commonwealths of the Northern Mariana Islands and Puerto Rico, and the territories of American Somoa, Guam, and the Virgin Islands. The Association works closely with the administration and the Congress on state-federal policy issues, serves as a vehicle for sharing knowledge of innovative programs among the states, and provides technical assistance and consultant services to governors on a wide range of management and policy issues. The Association's Center for Policy Research serves the governors by undertaking demonstration projects and providing anticipatory research on important policy issues.

   NGA has a task force on education and, during the past several years, has been involved in school restructuring as a way to achieve the nation's education goals. In 1991, NGA released a report, From Rhetoric to Action: State Progress in Restructuring the Education System, which examines state innovations and reforms that can serve as models for educators. They emphasized the need for comprehensive, system-wide change. They also identified and disseminated information on "pioneering" school districts that began the restructuring process early on.

   NGA defines restructuring as "fundamentally changing the way schools, districts, and state agencies are organized and do business in order to significantly raise the performance of all students, from potential dropouts to those who are college bound." Restructuring means that:

   - All students, regardless of background or disability, must be engaged in rigorous programs of instruction that ensure the acquisition of knowledge and skills necessary to succeed in a changing economy.

   - The public education system must be totally redesigned to focus on results that demonstrate high performance; to increase the skills, flexibility, and discretion of teachers and administrators; to provide powerful incentives for improvement and real consequences for persistent failure; and to encourage parents to take more responsibility for their children's education.

2. Materials: The following include some of the materials available from NGA:

   - Every Child Ready for School: Report of the Action Team on School Readiness (1992)

---

*Portions of this description are excerpted from the NGA report, From Rhetoric to Action: State Progress in Restructuring the Education System.

- Keys to Changing the System: Report of the Action Team on School Years (1992)
- Enhancing Skills for A Competitive World: Report of the Action Team on Lifelong Learning (1992)
- From Rhetoric to Action: State Progress in Restructuring the Education System (1990)
- Educating America: State Strategies for Achieving the National Education Goals (1990)
- Early Experiences in Restructuring Schools: Voices from the Field (1989)
- State Actions to Restructure Schools: The First Steps (1990).

3. **Contact for Further Information:**

National Governors' Association
Hall of the States
444 North Capitol Street, Suite 250
Washington, DC 20001-1572
202-624-5300
202-624-5313 (FAX)

4. **Selected Readings:**

Cohen, M. (1988). Restructuring the education system: Agenda for the 1990's. Washington, DC: National Governors' Association and Center for Policy Research.

David, J. L., Purkey, St., & White, P. (1988). Restructuring in progress: Lessons from pioneering districts. Washington, DC: National Governors' Association and Center for Policy Research.

David, J. L., Honetschlager, D., & Traiman, S. (1990). State actions to restructure schools: First steps. Washington, DC: National Governors' Association.

National Governors' Association. (1990). Results in education: 1990. Washington, DC: Author.

APPENDIX

List of Regional Educational Laboratories

List of Regional Educational Laboratories

Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc.
P.O. Box 1348
Charleston, WV 25325
(304) 347-0400
(304) 347-0487 (FAX)
Region Served: Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia

Far West Laboratory for Educational Research
and Development
730 Harrison Street
San Francisco, CA 94107-1242
(415) 565-3000
(415) 565-3012 (FAX)
Region Served: Arizona, California, Nevada, and Utah

Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory
2550 S. Parker Road, Suite 500
Aurora, CO 80014
(303) 337-0990
(303) 337-3005 (FAX)
Region Served: Colorado, Kansas, Nebraska, Missouri, Wyoming, North Dakota, and South Dakota

North Central Regional Educational Laboratory
1900 Spring Road, Suite 300
Oak Brook, IL 60521
(708) 571-4700
(708) 571-4716 (FAX)
Region Served: Minnesota, Wisconsin, Iowa, Illinois, Michigan, Indiana, and Ohio

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
101 S.W. Main Street, Suite 500
Portland, OR 97204-3297
(503) 275-9500
(503) 275-9489 (FAX)
Region Served: Alaska, Idaho, Oregon, Montana, and Washington

Pacific Regional Educational Laboratory
1164 Bishop Street, Suite 1409
Honolulu, HI 96813
(808) 532-1900
(808) 532-1922 (FAX)
Region Served: America Samoa, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Hawaii, Republic of the Marshall Islands, and Republic of Palau

Regional Laboratory for the Educational Improvement
of the Northeast and Islands
300 Brickstone Square, Suite 900
Andover, MA 01810
(508) 470-0098
(508) 475-9220 (FAX)
Region Served: Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Rhode Island, Vermont, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands

Research for Better Schools, Inc.
444 North Third Street
Philadelphia, PA 19123-4107
(215) 574-9300
(215) 574-0133 (FAX)
Region Served: Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and the District of Columbia

SouthEastern Regional Vision for Education
University of North Carolina at Greensboro
P.O. Box 5367
Greensboro, NC 27435-5367
(919) 334-3211 or (800) 755-3277
(919) 334-3268 (FAX)
Region Served: Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, and South Carolina

Southwest Educational Development Laboratory
211 East Seventh Street
Austin, TX 78701
(512) 476-6861
(512) 476-2286 (FAX)
Region Served: Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas